DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 427 JC 690 200

By-Darnes, G. Robert, Ed.

Proceedings of the Annual Illinois Junior College Conference (3rd, Rockford, Illinois, October 24-26, 1968).

Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Chicago.; Illinois Junior Coll. Board, Springfield.

Pub Date [68]

Note-127p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.45

Descriptors-Conferences, *Junior Colleges

Identifiers-*Illinois

Papers and addresses presented at this junior college conference included: the planning of statewide subject-are conferences, long-range master planning of curricula and campuses, workshop for admission officers and registrars, the use of advisory committees, uniform accounting practices, proposed state legislation, community services, responsibility of the college to the socioeconomically deprived, academic preparation of the faculty, a master of arts program in teaching for the instructors, coordinating adult education with other community agencies, adult education as a challenge, relationship of the junior college board to federal and other state agencies, admission policies and practices, an informative course-numbering system, the counseling and testing of part-time students, relationship of junior colleges to the extension divisions of senior colleges and universities, accommodation (academic, residential, etc.) at the senior institutions for the growing number of transfer students, a unit-cost study, student activities (intramural sports, newspaper, cultural series), student government, significance of student ID cards, relationship of state coordinating boards to recognition and accreditation (two views). (HH)

ED030427

PROCEEDINGS

THIRD ANNUAL

ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE CONFERENCE

Sponsored By

ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD

and

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

October 24-26, 1968

Illinois Junior College Board
544 Iles Park Place
Springfield, Illinois 62706

JC 690 200

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THIRD ANNUAL

STATEWIDE JUNIOR COLLEGE CONFERENCE

Sponsored By The

ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD

And The

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Editor

G. Robert Darnes

October 24-26, 1968

Rockford, Illinois

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 27 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

PREFACE

Everyone in higher education agrees that we are living in a world of rapid and continuing change. Although an over-simplification, the junior college is charged with finding new ways of meeting our educational needs through innovation in both curriculum and instructional procedures.

The opportunities for board members, educators, faculty and students to come together for purposes of discussing current problems and formulating plans for the continued development of junior colleges and their curricula continue to be limited in both number and length of time.

The Third Statewide Conference, co-sponsored by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges, was designed to provide additional opportunities for the divisions of the association to conduct their affairs. Moreover, the conference made it possible for the Illinois Junior College Board and members of its staff to join with representatives from the junior colleges and senior institutions throughout the State of Illinois in an effort to continue with the advancement of the state system of junior colleges.

Communications are always important on any college campus, but communication between junior colleges, state coordinating agencies and senior institutions must always receive attention in the exchange of thought and ideas. This publication is an outgrowth of the conference and it is hoped that this bulletin reflects the thoughts and ideas of the participants.

Appreciation is extended to Highland Community College and Rock Valley College for their efforts in successfully hosting the Conference.

G. Robert Darnes
Associate Secretary
Illinois Junior College
Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROGRAM--THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1968 Page

Address - Lyman A. Glenny 1

Should Statewide Subject Area Conferences Be Planned?
G. Robert Darnes, Chairman 10

Long Range Master Planning--Curriculum
Summary, Miss Susan Wood, Recorder 13

Workshop for Junior College Admission Officers and Registrars
Summary, Henry H. Brown, Recorder 14

Use of Advisory Committees - Summary, Loren E. Klaus,
Recorder 16

PROGRAM--FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1968

Uniform Accounting Manual - Summary, Carl E. Thornblad,
Recorder 18

Legislation - Summary, Albert H. Martin, Recorder 20

Long Range Master Planning - Campus
Floyd C. Tompkins, Chairman 22

Long Range Master Planning - Campus
Marvin Fitch, Speaker 23

Community Services in the Junior Colleges
Summary, Charles M. Medearis, Recorder 28

The Junior College and the Socio-Economically Deprived
Summary, Harry W. Abell, Recorder 29

Academic Preparation of Junior College Faculty
Edward J. Sabol, Chairman 31

A Master of Arts in Teaching Program for the Professional
Preparation of Junior College Instructors - Theodore Kauss 32

Coordination of Adult Education with Other Community Agencies
Robert F. Baker, Chairman 42

Adult Education: The Challenge to the Junior College
William S. Griffith, Speaker 42

Role of Illinois Junior College Board with Other State and
Federal Agencies - William K. Ogilvie, Chairman . . . 55

Admission Policies and Practices in Junior Colleges
Charles J. Carlsen, Chairman. 59

Purpose of a Course Numbering System - Herbert Zeitlin . 59

Progress Report on Master Plan Committee "B" - Donald H. Winandy 63

Counseling and Testing Part-Time Students - T. E. Deem 65

The Junior Colleges and the Extension Division of Colleges and Universities
Frank D. Sorenson, Chairman 70

Will There be a Place for the Junior College Transfer Student?
G. Robert Darnes, Chairman 73

Unit Cost Study
Wayne J. Stumph, Chairman 77

Student Activities in the Junior College
Tom Freeman, Chairman 79

Intramurals - Joseph F. Palmieri. 79

Cultural Arts Committee 83

Student Government on the Junior College Campus
Ronald Blumenburg, Chairman 85

Recognition of Students' ID Cards - Stanley R. Groh 86

State Coordinating Boards as Related to Recognition and Accreditation - Gerald W. Smith 88

State Coordinating Boards as Related to Recognition and Accreditation - Robert C. Bartlett 95

PROGRAM--SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1968

Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges - Special Business Meeting 101

Registration. 108

PROGRAM

Thursday, October 24, 1968

KICKOFF DINNER

Presiding	Frank F. Fowle Chairman, Illinois Junior College Board
Special Music	Rock Valley College Chorus Reuben Johnson, Director
Address	Lyman A. Glenny Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education

ILLINOIS HIGHER EDUCATION: PROGRESS AND OPPORTUNITY

The people of the State of Illinois have come a long way in providing educational opportunity in the years since the Board of Higher Education has been in existence. My paper is intended to relate, in part, the progress and gains made since 1962, but also to express my growing consternation at some conditions and trends likely to be inimical to the long-run welfare of higher education and to the young people which it serves.

The Board of Higher Education held its first meeting in January of 1962. By summer, Dr. Richard G. Browne, the Board's Executive Director, was setting up the machinery for conducting a Master Plan for the State's public system of colleges and universities. By fall of 1962, the dozen studies which were to provide the technical data and specialized recommendations were well underway. A year and a half later in July of 1964, the Board adopted its first Master Plan. With the aggressive leadership of Governor Kerner and the sympathetic ear of the General Assembly, 27 bills implementing the Plan were made law without a single dissenting vote in either house. As a result of that Plan and of the Phase II Plan adopted in 1967, much change has come about in the State.

In 1962 we found that Illinois was the 3rd wealthiest and the 5th most populous state in the country.

1. In 1962 Illinois had a college-going rate of 37% which was slightly below the national average. One-fourth of the students in the upper quartile and 44% of students in the 2nd quartile were not going to college.

   In 1968 the college-going rate is 55.7%. Far greater proportions of upper-ability level students are in college.

2. In 1962 we had 24 junior college campuses, only one of which was organized as an entity independent of a high school district. Today we have 35 districts authorized and 41 campuses accepted students this fall, seven of them for the first time.

3. In 1962 no junior college had a campus built for junior college functions. Today two new specially designed campuses are in use and 28 more are being built or are funded for construction.

4. In 1962 only 14 junior college campuses enrolled one thousand students or more. Today 27 colleges fit that category.

5. In 1962 there were only 28 different vocational-technical programs offered in all the public colleges and no college had more than 3 eligible for Federal aid. Today we have 101 different programs available and 20% of all credit hours produced by the junior colleges are in these programs. Several colleges offer more than 15 different programs.

6. Since 1962 the Chicago Circle Campus and the Edwardsville Campus have been constructed; the two former Chicago Teachers Colleges have come into the State system, and the legislature has authorized purchase of sites for 2 new senior universities.

7. In 1962 only 12% of the public senior college students were able to live at home and commute to college. Today at least 24% are doing this and the proportion will continue to increase as new commuter universities come into existence.

8. In 1962 only 6 senior campuses offered master's level work and 3 doctoral work. Today 11 campuses offer master's work and 7 doctoral work.

9. In 1962 we had 119,668 (on campus head-count) students enrolled in the public institutions. Today we have 243,795, a 103.7% increase.

10. In 1962, 52.4% of all students in the State universities were freshmen-sophomores. Today only 44.2% are at this level. At the same time, the junior colleges have increased their proportion of lower-division students enrolled in public institutions from 52.5% to 61.2%.

11. Since 1962 all senior campuses have doubled their enrollments except the University of Illinois at Urbana, the Medical Center, and Carbondale. Two have more than tripled their student body size --- Northeastern Illinois State College and Chicago Circle.

12. In 1962 the State provided $5 million each biennium for its State Scholarship program. Today $14.9 million go into it and a new grant program is also funded at $14.9 million.

In addition, a $100 million Guaranteed Locan program is in effect.

13. For the 1961-63 biennium the State appropriated $195,000,000 (does not include reappropriations and emergencies) for capital construction and $235,595,000 for operating expenses. In 1967 the legislature appropriated $432,050,000 for capital and $592,603,000 for operations, increases of 121.6% and 151.5% respectively. And oddly enough, these increases, as large as they seem, are at exactly the average for all states.

These comparisons of then and now - of progress and gain - show results of which we can be proud. Perhaps more than most others, the people who are gathered in this room tonight can be credited with these vast accomplishments.

We have indeed made certain kinds of change to the benefit of the society, but we have no reason for complacency. We have at least as grave issues before us as we have already resolved.

Two major concerns of the public must give pause to those of us who operate in the world of higher education. Both are deepening by the hour. Neither concern is likely to be placated or even ameliorated if the higher education community continues to act as if its methods and practices were above reproach and worth endless amounts of money.

The first concern revolves about the quality of course and curriculum and their appropriateness to meet student and societal needs, and the second is over the rapidly increasing real costs of providing higher education. Both concerns portend serious trouble. Faculty members, administrators and governing boards all share responsibility for this growing public disillusionment, and we all must mend our ways if we are to avoid excessive repression and control by that society which we claim to serve.

Part of the disillusionment could be foreseen some years ago when higher education seemed to be touted by many as the panacea for all social and economic ills. Most of us in academe, of course, knew better, but decided to glow and grow in this new and unexpected light of public esteem. Naturally, the public was eventually to be disappointed that we could not provide the millennium, but in the meantime, we could provide ourselves with many academic and material "goodies." And we did.

The faculty members got much higher salaries, rapid promotion, more sabbatical leaves, fewer classes to teach, more grants, bigger libraries and a new office, (and, at rare times, a parking space.) The administrators got higher salaries too, but of greater reward, a larger and larger campus with thousands of additional students, dozens of brick and mortar monuments (some soaring high in the sky) and a budget of sufficient grandeur to reflect an image of true greatness. Board members got theirs through pride, and perhaps vicariously, through approving the budgets, authorizing the bond issues, building the monuments and cursing the capricious restraints of government for shortsightedness and inability to recognize meritorious leadership at the local level.

Yes, as Logan Wilson, President of the American Council on Education, recently stated, "We have never had it so good,"[1] but what fantastic largess did the society derive from its unprecedented beneficence?

Rest assured - also I have a list of what we gave. It may not be as full of "goodies" as we received, but then the remainder of society did not sacrifice itself through four grinding years of college, plus even more arduous years in graduate school, doing original research and making new contributions to human knowledge. The society did not forego the joys of marriage and children and a decent standard of living for all those learning years. Nevertheless, we have given much.

"Society" has gotten - places in college for all its children; never mind that half of them cannot meet our "high" standards and drop out within two years. Society has gotten courses and programs proven sound by long tradition and our dog-eared class notes; never mind that the students find them not relevant and utterly boring. Society has gotten mostly the lecture method; never mind that it is the least effective of known teaching techniques or that the young have had their learning receptors conditioned by the "wasteland" of television. We gave instruction pitched to the understandings and values of the upper middle-class; never mind that great numbers of new students hold lower middle and even working-class values and aspirations. We gave knowledge by the notebook full; never mind that the student learns best by self-generation and seeking. We gave description, history and theory; never mind that it was so poorly presented that most students understood little and cared even less. We gave thousands upon thousands of articles and papers based upon "pure" research; never mind their insignificance or obscurity. We gave our life's blood in chrome sparkling laboratories and classrooms; never mind that our blood was stigmatized by an Rh factor and coagulation. And if this were not enough, we gave them conferences, national and international; never mind that their chief result was edification of faculty about airline schedules, hotel mismanagement and bar-restaurant discotheques. We gave them all this; never mind that our unit costs also soared up. Yes, we have indeed given it to them almost as if their faith in us had said, "sock it to me."

My sarcasm, exaggeration, and irony no doubt are discomforting to many, if not most of you. Yet, however facetious, the hard core of truth in it cannot be ignored. We planners and managers have indeed made the gains in opportunity, in numbers, and in facilities which I have described for Illinois; but we teachers, we professors, have not been entirely honest - even with ourselves, much less the public, if we really believe that the quality and appropriateness of our courses and programs have improved or that the means by which we teach and profess are anything more than anachronistic. We are not honest if we say that grantsmanship and time off for so-called research is much more than a modern boondoggle - allowing us to see much of the world and little of our students. Even the large foundations are catching on that a myriad of heterogeneous individual efforts to re-invent the wheel produce few new or better wheels. And now the public, too, is fast catching on, mostly because we carelessly disregard radical changes in the age, values, and sophistication of present day students and equally disregard the exhorbitant charge to society's bank account for what we do.

---

[1] Chronicle of American Higher Education
October 14, 1968

Parents were worried about getting their children into college-but now they worry even more about keeping them there. The drop-out and failure rate of students continues at a high rate regardless of whether we use selective admission standards or not, or whether we do individual research or not. With a few exceptions, we teach virtually the same courses, often with the same content, as we did thirty years ago.

We, as a profession, are doing far too little to adapt curriculum to the radical changes in societal needs, and we struggle incessantly to avoid use of modern technology to improve instruction and productivity.

Discerning parents are discouraged when they pay higher and higher taxes to support education and then find that half their children cannot stay in college or that the academic program is inappropriate. Parents of dropouts are even more resentful if they have worked hard to bring a new junior or senior college into existence in their communities.

We found almost a hundred years ago that a classical education did not meet the needs of an emerging industrial democracy. We should now recognize that the academic solutions to those problems of a hundred years ago are not pertinent for this age.

The Committee for the Student in Higher Education has described our condition in far more caustic language than we like to hear. It states,

> "The power of the professional academic guilds over undergraduate instruction should be broken. Faculty veto groups, however powerful, can no longer be permitted to block reform in undergraduate education . . . .
>
> Colleges and universities have shown little inclination to ease up on "the tyranny of prerequisites and sequences of courses" so that "he who departs from the straight and narrow path to graduation is expected to pay severe penalties for his idiosyncratic behavior."

As a further comment on this point, I quote Jack Vaughn, Peace Corps Director, who found that the volunteers trained in special programs offered by colleges and universities ended up with an inadequate knowledge of the host-country language, an incomplete appreciation of the country's culture and an insufficient amount of skill. He states that when Peace Corps administrators complained about this:

> "We discovered that most colleges and universities really didn't want to be bothered with developing new, and badly needed, educational techniques. With a few great exceptions, they indicated pretty clearly to us that if we wanted new techniques, we'd better develop them ourselves. And so we did. And though we still have

> a long way to go before we teach as well as we should, we teach our particular fields much better than most colleges and universities could right now. We not only teach languages faster and more effectively than any university does, but we teach perhaps 100 languages no university teaches. We teach cultures more perceptively than any university does. There are dozens of skills that we can teach in 13 weeks."

Moreover, one may add, our methods force students to spend their 2 years or their four years fulfilling empty requirements and going through the mechanics of learning how to win in the competitive grading system.

It is this outmoded, repetitious, irrelevant curriculum combined with "horse and buggy" teaching methods which call for attention.

Our commitment must be toward motivation, toward relevancy, toward the learning process, and toward making man liberal and open by challenging, through reason, his values and his behavior.

Change we must or face up to the fact that change will be forced upon us by outside agents, and soon.

The other great public concern, the cost of higher education, is likely to be the compelling cause for change in higher education. The public feels it has excuse enough to interfere with campus life and academic freedom because of riots and distrubances on campus. We should not allow inefficiency or misdirection of public resources in such ways as to further undermine public confidence in our activities. We must see that the fundamental purposes of the universities are protected.

The following facts will indicate why public confidence is waning:

In 1962 the operating budget for the then 119,668 students in the public senior colleges and university system in Illinois was $125 million. If that same number of students were to be educated today, the costs would be $140 million. In the junior colleges in 1962, the estimated cost was less than $600 a year per student. In 1967 it cost about $1,000 per year, or 66.7% more in 5 years.

Of most significance about the increases is that more money is being requested to augment the already high costs for the existing student body than for additional students. For the next biennium, the state senior colleges and universities are asking $120 million for program improvements and salary increases as against $90 million for added enrollment. This year also shows that the unit costs of the junior colleges are rising much more rapidly at the freshman-sophomore levels than in senior colleges, and in several cases they already exceed that unit cost. As a consequence, the junior colleges are now requesting that state aid be raised from $11.50 per credit hour to $15.50. An increase of 34.8%.

Footnote: As quoted in Intercollegiate Press Bulletins, Vol. 23, No. 9, October 14, 1968, p. 53.

Why should the unit costs per student rise so rapidly?

Besides the general inflation in the economy, several reasons stand out in significance. First is the increase in faculty salaries. Ten years ago an educational objective was to double those salaries within a decade. Salaries had long lagged relative to increases for other professions and skilled labor. The goal was and remains a legitimate one and is within sight in most public institutions in Illinois. Underlying the ability of higher education to obtain steady salary raises of 6 to 8% is the shortage of faculty members in most fields of academic inquiry. The competition among institutions throughout the country for faculty specialists has provided great leverage in achieving salary goals.

The faculty shortage also accounts, in large part, for some other cost increases, the legitimacy of which is open to some question. As fringe benefits over and above salary, the faculties demand a smaller teaching load plus time off for research. In other words, faculties demand and many are getting more money for doing less work.

The public has a right to be concerned when a profession historically oriented to service and sacrifice suddenly becomes self-serving. The current demand of some junior college and state college faculties that their work loads be reduced from 16 to 12 or from 12 hours teaching per week to 9, means a 20-25% increase in the unit cost of instruction. Then when these faculties also demand a quarter or half-time off for research, the cost of instruction increases another 25 or 50 percent. And these increases occur without adding one additional student on the enrollment roster. In fact, because additional coordinators, assistants and secretarial staff are needed for the research function, the number of students which can be financed may be less.

Still another cost arising out of leverage induced by the faculty shortage is for more office space, more staff assistants, better equipped laboratories and classrooms, and third generation computers. Much of these increments are attributable to the research function rather than to teaching and become a condition of employment by potential faculty members. Certainly research is a legitimate function and some research by some particularly well-qualified faculty members is desirable, but building, staffing and equipping a little empire for each faculty member while he seeks to reduce his teaching load in order to devote his attention and commitment to personal intellectual interests seem to be a questionable use of public resources.

Moreover, as these "fringe" costs mount, the public resistance also mounts to increasing faculty salaries by substantial amounts. In the budgets we are currently reviewing, salary increases account for only 16% of all new costs.

When one considers that enrollments will again double in 10 or 15 years, (in junior colleges, in 7) higher education will require a greater proportion of the Gross National (and State) Product than now. If the demands of faculty which I have related above were to be met in Illinois, the minimal budget of junior colleges by 1975 would be 6 times the existing budget.

Consequently, as we push the public to its limits of monetary sacrifice to sustain a terribly ineffective and ill-functioning system, the day will be hastened when the demand for reform will create a show-down - possibly an educational revolution. Instead of changing the present system by further expansion in the piecemeal, haphazard, inefficient traditional way, the public may soon react to force reforms toward more functional alternatives.

Given these conditions and trends it appears to me that the following "happenings" may result across the country in the next few years:

1. Considering the other social reforms which must also be undertaken by our society, it seems improbable that higher education can continue to demand and get a greater and greater proportion of the country's total economic output. This will be especially true at the state and local level. Federal sources will provide huge amounts for some years to come, but that source too will tend toward a constant proportion of the Gross National Product within a few years.

2. Reform of higher education, including programs, curriculum, and teaching methods will occur primarily because of the competitive entrance on the scene of more functional alternatives, such as:

   a. Student sponsored courses and independent cooperative ("Free") schools,

   b. The communications industry, such as IBM and Xerox,

   c. Contract programs such as those designed by the Peace Corps, military and industry, and

   d. Possibly some new faculty members from the "now generation," who may be committed to teaching and to service.

3. An abrupt slowdown in unit cost increases is likely within 5 years. Chief reasons will be:

   a. Alleviation in 1971-72 of the faculty shortage with its consequent bargaining leverage.

   b. Increased efforts by coordinating boards and the state legislatures to improve productivity through financial rewards and penalties.

   c. Realization by faculties, or at least the administrators, that new teaching methods and techniques, including self-study and technologies, will improve the quality as well as quantity of instruction.

4. Aid of all kinds will be given to the nonpublic colleges and universities both at state and national levels, through the several means already used at the federal level, as well as outright grants on a per-student

basis. As a result, the nonpublic colleges will be required to contribute more and more information about their operations and will be caught up in about the same amount of bureaucracy as the public institutions.

5. Also coming is greater repression of institutional academic freedom by state and federal governments along lines already apparent in relation to financial aid for students engaging in riots. Faculty members and administrators will also be chastised even to the point of changing tenure conditions by law. Many of the new standards will be invoked as conditions to financial aid and grants, which only a few institutions will be able to resist.

6. Unionization of faculty members will increase rapidly. Members who now feel that unions can scarcely improve on "paradise" will see differently as repressive measures are taken with reference to fundamental academic freedom and the financing of fringe benefits.

7. As a result of increasing conflict between the governments and donors on the one hand, and higher education on the other, unions will extend the use of the strike into higher education at least as much as in elementary and secondary education today. Compulsory arbitration is very likely to occur as a result of such conflicts.

8. The cost of education paid directly by the student, especially those in lower income levels, will approach zero dollars. Freshmen-sophomore years may be free to all, especially in junior colleges. Federal aid will make this possible.

In Illinois we can expect the following specific kinds of actions: (Remember I speak as an individual and not as the on-going Executive Director of the Board of Higher Education.)

1. By 1971 very great pressure by the state government to hold the line on cost increases arising out of faculty benefits such as smaller teaching loads and released time for research.

2. By 1975 or sooner, computers will determine capital budgets and possibly operating budgets for all public institutions.

3. Junior colleges will be operating under a state equalization formula. The State will not increase its share of costs and may reduce the share as more federal funds become available.

4. By 1975 all territory in the State will be arbitrarily placed in a junior college district if the area is not voluntarily annexed or already in a district.

5. Special incentives will be given to junior colleges to increase the number of programs in vocational-technical and career-oriented programs and the number of students enrolled in them. Aid for liberal arts and

traditional transfer courses will be held at constant levels or even reduced in order to allow the incentive payments for occupational education.

6. Unit costs for offering junior college liberal arts and science education will be kept below those of the public senior institutions or the freeze and prohibition on lower-division enrollments now placed on the senior colleges may well be lifted.

Thus, while we have worked diligently over these past half dozen years and our measurable progress has been great, we still face critical problems. What we have done so far has primarily been an extension of what preceded. More of everything, rather than the best of things. Increased numbers, rather than increased quality - increases in budgets, buildings, students and programs. But radical change in content, in organization, and in the means for providing education - No. These are the challenges. A few farsighted, committed professors and administrators have already begun the new work. The rest of us must join them with the same verve and dedication which we have displayed in creating new numbers of things - or the review of progress made by another Executive Director in another decade will not be pleasing to any of us.

* * *

SHOULD STATE-WIDE SUBJECT AREA CONFERENCES BE PLANNED? . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . G. Robert Darnes
Associate Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board

"Engineering Report" . . . . H. L. Wakeland
Associate Dean of Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana

"Higher Education Viewpoint" . . . . .Walter S. Lowell
Head, School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation,
Eastern Illinois University

"Junior College Viewpoint" . . . . Henry M. Milander
Dean of Instruction, Belleville Area College

Discussion

Recorder . . . . John H. Anthony
Dean of Faculty, College of DuPage

SHOULD STATE-WIDE SUBJECT AREA CONFERENCES BE PLANNED?

Dr. G. Robert Darnes, Associate Secretary of the Illinois Junior College Board, served as chairman for the meeting and set the tone for the discussion with the following:

> "Junior colleges are being concerned with the large number of subject area conferences now being held on individual university campuses. It is not that junior college administrators and faculty do not appreciate this effort but the number of such conferences is becoming uncontrollable. In addition, when senior institutions have subject area conferences, the problems discussed become unique to the institutions involved. They do not solve the problems of our articulation on a state-wide basis.
>
> "As junior colleges apply for curriculum approval in a college transfer area, the question to which the junior college is asked to address itself is, 'How does this curriculum transfer?' The characteristic of a good transfer program is its degree of transferability. One can readily see that for curricula to articulate with a majority of institutions it is necessary that information in guidelines be developed concerning subject areas on a state-wide-basis."

Dr. Darnes explained that two state-wide subject area conferences in the field of music were sponsored by the Illinois Junior College Board during the 1967-68 academic year. In addition, many other requests to sponsor state-wide conferences in other subject areas have also been received. It was suggested by Dr. Darnes that before making future plans regarding state-wide subject conferences the views of both senior institutions and junior colleges should be explored.

Dr. H. L. Wakeland, Associate Dean of Engineering at the University of Illinois, provided a summary of a report compiled by a committee to explore areas of articulation regarding engineering programs between two-year and four-year colleges. Dr. Wakeland summarized the engineering report as follows:

> "The recognized colleges of engineering in Illinois, realizing that junior colleges are experiencing a dynamic period of growth and wanting to maintain individuality and flexibility in their programs, have studied subject matter needs of transfer students seeking to enter engineering studies in the senior college at the junior level and have made a recommendation of course work to be included in a two-year pre-engineering program. The recommended pre-engineering program (presented in bulletin form--" Community and Junior Colleges Pre-Engineering Program") provides one suggested set of courses which will allow students to enter any of the engineering colleges in Illinois at the end of two years of study with the expectation of completing the Bachelor's Degree in Engineering in a reasonable period of time. The pre-engineering program recommended allows for the acceptance of credits through a range of hours to be completed in specific subject matter areas as opposed to course-by-course transfer policies. The program further emphasizes that accreditation must be on an institutional

> basis as opposed to a course-by course basis and that reasonable handling of transfer students requires trust on the part of both institutions concerned. The report also emphasized the desirability for junior college students to complete the entire two-year program at the junior college level prior to seeking transfer and also recognized the possibility of basing admission on the completion of an Associate Degree at some time in the future. The institutions represented in the report also provided brief statements regarding special problems which might exist when students transfer to any one of the specific schools."

Dr. Walter S. Lowell, Head of the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, at Eastern Illinois University, presented the higher educationj point of view toward state-wide subject area conferences. Dr. Lowell emphasized the need for the planning of state-wide conferences upon the following bases:

1. Both junior college and four-year college people must keep foremost in mind the basic needs of the student and the successful completion of the student's program with the least number of artificial hurdles.

2. There is a lack of mutual trust and understanding by the new and eager community colleges and the senior institutions which are characterized by years of tradition. Both points of view must be respected.

3. State-wide meetings would bring two-year and four-year institutions face-to-face to discuss common problems and common feelings regarding subject matter articulation. Such meetings would be of great value in keeping positive lines of communication open.

The two-year college point of view was presented by Dr. Henry Milander, Dean of Instruction at Belleville Area College. Dr. Milander expressed the need for state-wide subject area conferences as a result of the rapid growth of the community college movement in Illinois. He pointed out some of the implications for the junior colleges and their personnel regarding subject area conferences:

1. With the many subject area meetings scheduled in any one week, one per year, serious manpower shortages can develop on campus if all these and other meetings are attended.

2. Distances traveled to and travel, lodging and meal resource allocations for subject area conferences pose financial limitations.

3. Many of the conferences attended raise questions in the minds of the participants regarding whether anything new was learned and whether the institution holding the conference was trying to sell itself rather than to articulate.

Dr. Milander also raised the question, "Who should plan state-wide subject area conferences and why? It was his belief that the Illinois Revised Statutes of 1967 make it very clear that the State Junior College Board has both the responsibility and the authority for planning state-wide subject matter conferences.

Discussion ensued regarding the presentations. It was the general conclusion of the participants attending the meeting that state-wide subject area conferences should be planned and the responsibility for such planning should rest with the Illinois Junior College Board. This conclusion was dramatically pointed out when the participants unanimously expressed these feelings with a show of hands.

* * *

LONG RANGE MASTER PLANNING--CURRICULUM . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Eugene McClintock
President, Kaskaskia College

Speaker . . . . Nathan A. Ivey
President, John A. Logan College

Discussion

Recorder . . . . Miss Susan Wood
Administrative Assistant, Joliet Junior College

Summary

A curriculum is defined as a sequence of potential experiences for the purpose of disciplining youth and adults. It is always a reflection of the culture and sub-cultures. As the culture undergoes serious modifications, the curriculum becomes an object of concern to the more sensitive members of the teaching profession and society at large.

Economic and social changes during the last thirty years have had a tremendous impact on education and particularly on the curricula of the comprehensive junior colleges. These changes have vitally affected the educational service needs of the people we serve.

The objectives of the curriculum should be stated in terms of desired changes to be effected in the learner. The selection of curricular materials should be made with due regard for the purposes of the institution, the number of students to be served and their needs and abilities, and the costs of providing the instruction in terms of faculty, library, laboratory, and other instructional facilities.

In master planning in a short or long range basis, one should keep in mind the determinants of the curriculum. Using Blocker, Plummer and Richardson, The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis as his source, Dr. Ivey listed these determinants under three main headings: (1) Extra-institutional Influences; (2) Intrainstitutional Influences; and (3) Administrative or Mediating Influences.

Long-range planning begins with the statement of philosophy and purposes of the particular junior college. The planning must provide for maximum flexibility to allow for a changing philosophy, modification of objectives, and new patterns of financial support. The construction of permanent facilities must be phased to accommodate anticipated growth and modifications in college curricula.

The purpose of Illinois Public Junior College Act of 1965 is to provide for a statewide system of comprehensive public junior colleges. According to this Act at least 15% of the courses must be in occupational, technical, or semi-technical fields. In 1967-68 thirty-four percent of the courses offered and seventeen percent of the enrollments were in occupational oriented courses of study. There is need for development of new programs in this area.

In the discussion that followed Dr. Ivey's presentation, it was generally agreed that a junior college must remain sensitive to the demands of its culture and its own area's subculture and should, therefore, adopt the "concept of continual adjustment."

Of immediate concern to all institutions should be the inclusion of courses in the history of the black people and their contributions to society. This concern for and understanding of the subcultures should be reflected in the evaluation of the textbooks as well as other supplementary materials.

* * *

WORKSHOP FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMISSION OFFICERS AND REGISTRARS . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Donn B. Stansbury
Director of Admissions, W. R. Harper College

"Board of Higher Education Task Force #4". . . . . Robert A. McGrath
Registrar of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

"Policies of Private Institutions" . . . . Irma T. Halfter
Director, University Evaluation, DePaul University

Discussion

Recorder . . . . Henry H. Brown
Dean of Student Personnel Services, Lincoln Land Junior College

Summary

Speaking first was Mr. McGrath, who is chairman of the Task Force Group of Committee B of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Mr. McGrath reported on the work of the committee which is currently studying the matter of the transfer student. This study has grown out of the realization of the importance of the transfer student. Mr. McGrath made the following points.

1. The advising of transfer students, although it takes an amount of time equal to that spent on freshmen students, it is not of the same quality and transfer students lack the essentials of what they should know about the University they transfer to for some time after they have been enrolled.

2. Faculty attitude often seems to be that the transfer student has received some kind of tainted education from an inferior institution and the thing to do is keep him out.

3. Some institutions do not accept "D" work, even though they accept their own "D's" towards graduation.

4. Some institutions require a transfer student to take the last part of a sequential program whether he has had it already or not.

Task Force Number 4, Committee B, believes the matter of policies and practices of higher educational institutions in Illinois in regard to the transfer student is an important ingredient within the master plan of Illinois. We also realize that we know very little about what our policies and practices are, that they are institutionalized and individualistic and that the student desiring to transfer has a most difficult time finding out all that he needs to know and should know.

Mr. McGrath then spoke of the questionnaire to be sent to the various institutions in Illinois in the near future. The questionnaire is going to ask some pertinent questions relative to the transfer student. We are going to be asked:

1. If we have a definition of what constitutes a transfer student, with some specific questions such as: if you admit a student in the spring and he takes work during the summer do you regard him as a freshman or as a transfer student.

2. Do our practices relative to our transfer students cause them problems that freshman do not encounter.

3. How to get word and when to get word to the transfer student as to what we are accepting.

Mr. McGrath concluded his remarks by reviewing the work of Committee B briefly. Committee B currently has three task forces at work.

1. An updating of student retention information to see how we do in comparison to 1962 when the 1958 class was studied.

2. A student characteristic study which will give us valuable information about our education of student body in the state, and

3. One which has devoted its attention to the transfer student.

The second speaker on the program was Dr. Irma T. Halfter, DePaul University, who spoke on the policies of private institutions. These points were made:

1. No one can speak authoritatively for private universities. Their federations are becoming active in spelling out their policies.

2. Articulation problems between public and private institutions are more similar than different.

a. Faculties in public and private four-year institutions guard the integrity of their educational offerings (to secure their cooperation, start state-wide articulation conference in the subject matter areas).

b. In both public and private institutions, therefore, course equivalencies or evaluation by areas of subject matter difficult to achieve.

c. Both public and private institutions do not have policies defining and classifying transfer students (as indicated by Task Force 4's proposed questionnaire).

d. Faculties in public and private four-year institutions are not familiar with the distinctions among the levels of curricula in junior colleges.

3. These differences with respect to private institutions should be borne in mind:

a. Accepting transfer students in a private university may require a formal commitment of the President, Chancellor or Provost (for the reasons discussed in the presentation).

b. Assuming such a commitment the junior colleges then should ask (as with public institutions):

1. Is there an evaluation officer for junior college transfer students?
2. Is there a prospectus for transfer students?
3. Are there scholarships for transfer students?
4. Is there a credit-by-examination program open to transfer students?
5. Is there institutional research to show the success of students at public or private institutions?

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS MAY HAVE SOME DIFFERENCES FROM PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN THAT THEY TEND TO HAVE CURRICULAR DESIGNS rather than DIVISIONAL COURSE OFFERINGS.

The junior colleges will respect those who feel they cannot incorporate transfers, four year or two year, into that design and those who will. Private universities may be dealing with more permeations and combinations of previous colleges attended since they are hospitable to out-of-state transfers. Patterns of previous attendance were discussed.

* * *

USE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES. . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Arthur C. Muns
Professor and Curriculum Coordinator of College of Continuing Education,
Northern Illinois University

Speaker . . . . Gordon K. Simonsen
Executive Dean, Triton College

Recorder . . . . .Loren C. Klaus
President, Shawnee Junior College

Summary

Gordon K. Simonsen, Executive Dean of Triton College, stressed the importance of advisory committees to the local junior college program. Not only are such committees ordinarily required by state and national funding agencies in regard to occupational education, but they also can serve as valuable resource aids to the college instructors.

Dean Simonsen pointed out services advisory committees may provide as follows:

1. They can give advice on the kinds of training people need to enter a specific job.

2. They can give advice on the kinds of equipment needed for good instruction.

3. They can give advice on the kinds and types of jobs available in the area.

4. They can suggest names of part-time instructors who could teach special courses.

5. They can publicize the program to prospective students - both young people and adults.

6. They can suggest worthwhile field trips.

7. They can keep the instructors up-to-date on the latest industrial trends.

8. They can suggest better procedures in miscellaneous areas that may make the difference between average and quality programs.

Procedural advice was given as follows:

1. Keep each committee small (6-7 members).

2. Keep minutes on all committee meetings.

3. Consider holding day-time meetings.

In conclusion, Simonsen said the college staff can help the committee system function best by recruiting new members before the need arises, and by helping them prepare workable agendas.

* * *

UNIFORM ACCOUNTING MANUAL . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . .Robert J. English
Coordinator of Systems Analysis, Triton College

Panel

James M. Troutman Assistant Business Manager, Illinois Central College	George A. Kautz Chief Accountant, College of DuPage
Richard D. Fagan Dean of Business Affairs, Highland Community College	Larry Saslaw Representative, IBM

Discussion

Recorder . . . . Carl E. Thornblad
Associate Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board

Summary of Presentations and Discussion

The Uniform Accounting Manual for Illinois Junior Colleges will be published in draft form early in 1969. This Manual will serve as a guide to Illinois Junior Colleges in organizing and maintaining the fiscal records of each college.

The first meeting of the Uniform Accounting Committee was held in Springfield on December 21, 1966. Official approval for the development of the Uniform Accounting Manual was given by the State Board on January 13, 1967. Monthly meetings were held by the Committee over the last eighteen months. In addition, task force groups met from time to time to work on specific tasks, as directed.

The original timetable was to have the Uniform Accounting Manual available for distribution not later than October 1, 1968. The Manual was to be used on a voluntary basis by the Illinois Junior Colleges during the 1969-70 fiscal year, during which time it will be subject to review and revision. Final adoption for uniform use by all public junior colleges has been scheduled for July 1, 1970. Due to a change of staff at the Illinois Junior College Board office, the first draft will not be available until early 1969.

Section VIII of the Uniform Accounting Manual, the Chart of Accounts, has been published and distributed since mid-1968. The Chart of Accounts includes a coding system according to function, sub-function and object definitions, plus a recommended budget for them. In preparing this coding system, the Committee reviewed numerous accounting manuals from state and national sources. None were found totally acceptable for statewide use by junior colleges. Therefore, it was the decision of the Committee to develop its own Manual. The first major segment to be developed was the Chart of Accounts. This included a fourteen-digit coding system with function, sub-function and object definitions.

In reviewing the work of the Committee to date, several problems have been brought to light:

1. A chapter should be included concerning external audits to serve as a guide for junior college auditors and to improve Audit procedure. It has been suggested that "audit reports only reflect what is wanted--" therefore, if audits are to be useful to the college administration, their needs must be spelled out.
2. Accounting for public and auxiliary services are used differently in different places in the Manual.
3. There is no asset code for inventory within the public auxiliary services function.
4. It has been suggested that Data Processing could be an object rather than a sub-function.
5. A number of inadequacies have been brought to light regarding the Working Cash Fund.

International Business Machines Corporation, in cooperation with Triton College, has developed a program package for junior college accounting. This package is used by Triton College for the following operations.

1. Creation of a budget.
2. Maintenance of encumbrances.
3. Accounts Payable.
4. Recording and check writing.

Other uses of electronic data processing in the Triton package are:

1. Inventory control.
2. Student "charge-backs."
3. Preparation of the unit cost study.

This package will be made available to all junior colleges through IBM in the near future.

* * *

LEGISLATION . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Albert H. Martin
Associate Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board

Discussants . . . . Turner H. Trimble
Special Assistant to the Chancellor of Chicago City College;
Chairman, Legislative Committee of IACJC

Albert H. Martin

Recorder . . . . .Albert H. Martin

LEGISLATION

The basis for the discussion was the listing of legislative proposals prepared by the staff of the Illinois Junior College Board and dated September 11, 1968.

Suggested Legislation to be Introduced by
The Illinois Junior College Board -
76th General Assembly

1. Edit the Illinois Public Junior College Act to remove duplicate sections; standardize use of terms such as "Chairman" of the Board, rather than "President"; and change "Resident voter" to "Registered voter."

2. Define the term "appropriate county superintendent" in Sections 106-5.1 and 106-5.2. When used in Sections 106-5.1 and 106-5.2 in regard to a petition filed under Section 106-5 and 106-5.4, the term means that county superintendent with whom the petition was filed. When used in regard to a petition filed under 106-5.3 the term means the county superintendent who conducted the election for the establishment of a Class I junior college district, the boundaries of which are to be amended by an order of the State Board and executed by the same county superintendent.

3. Define the word "residence" as applied to the student when used throughout the Act, particularly with reference to Section 106-2.

4. Make recommendation on rate of State Apportionment.

5. Provide that local junior college boards are to be called "Boards of Trustees."

6. Provide that public notices of hearings on annexations and disconnections be published once.

7. Provide that supplemental charge-back billings may be computed on the actual cost basis, rather than on the basis of the per capita cost of the previous year.

8. Amend ballot form to include location, precinct number, etc., on the back.

9. Clarify section regarding Treasurer's Fidelity Bond required relative to bond sales.

10. Provide for annual publication of a financial statement.

11. Specify the effective date for annexation and disconnection regarding participation of residents of the area in Board and other elections.

12. Make citizens in annexed territory eligible for Board membership after the final order for annexation is issued but prior to July 1.

13. Make the effective date for annexations the date that final order is issued rather than July 1.

14. Provide that a portion of a high school or unit district which has been severed from the remainder of that district by some other political entity be declared contiguous to the junior college district including the remainder of that district.

15. Declare certain areas under special conditions contiguous for junior college purposes.

16. Legalize the use of the same election judges by junior colleges and common schools.

17. Eliminate the candidate's address on the ballot and eliminate "Incorporated" or "Unincorporated" if the election of board members is not subject to membership based upon assessed valuation.

Suggested Legislation Relating to the Illinois Public Junior Colleges to be Introduced by Other Agencies, 76th General Assembly

1. Provide an authorized tax rate for educational and building funds which could be levied by the Board without submitting the proposition to referendum but to include a "backdoor" referendum.

2. Provide for the filing of a separate direct tax levy to finance working cash fund.

3. Extend through 1970 the authorization for a high school, unit or non-high school district to extend the 3¢ tax rate.

4. Establish a deadline after which all non-junior college territory must be included in a junior college district.

5. Provide for the appointment of a junior college police department, the personnel of which would be peace officers possessed of the powers which policemen have.

6. Liberalize the topics which may be discussed by public bodies in executive sessions.

7. Authorize municipalities to develop parking and other vehicular regulations relative to junior college campuses.

8. Extend the authority for village ordinances affecting parking on private property to include junior college campuses.

9. Provide specific criminal legislation with substantial penalties for telephone bomb threats to a junior college.

Special attention was given to a number of items. For example, there was a question about how to define an "emancipated minor" for residency purposes in legal terms which would still allow a junior college district to make local interpretations to fit individual cases. In this discussion the matter of reciprocity across state boundaries was introduced. It was pointed out that problems were likely to be greatest in working out an agreement with Indiana since Indiana has no public junior colleges.

In the discussion on the rate of State apportionment there was objection to the pension payments by the State being considered as part of apportionment.

In regard to supplemental charge-back billings to school districts based on actual costs there was some question about how this could be done. Administrative costs of a second billing would be high and the school districts would have no established costs upon which to base budget figures.

Lack of time prevented full discussion of a number of other items in which the group was interested. Two additional suggestions were made:

(1) Authorize each junior college as a G.E.D. test center.

(2) Provide specific direction for the division of assets when a Class I junior college district is formed which includes a Class II junior college.

* * *

LONG RANGE MASTER PLANNING - CAMPUS . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Floyd C. Tompkins
Associate Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board

Speaker. . . . . .Marvin Fitch
Architect, Fridstein, Fitch and Partners, Architects of Chicago

Recorder . . . . .Lawrence Auten
Specialist in Research and Grants, Danville Junior College

After the appropriate introductions of the chairman, the speaker, and the recorder for this seminar session, Mr. Tompkins relinquished the floor to Mr. Fitch who read the following prepared statements:

LONG RANGE MASTER PLANNING - CAMPUS

I approach my task here with certain trepidation, partly because I think any architect or planner would feel a little bit uncomfortable in the presence of more than a few educators. I suppose though that there is some comfort to be found in the circumstance that almost everybody is, in fact, engaged in planning. At any rate, I have never been on a campus where there was any shortage of campus planners. We are all engaged in planning, whether planning is our special responsibility or not. We are engaged in it in everything we do that affects the future. All of us are planners, if only negatively, when we act without sufficient questioning of what we are doing today and tomorrow, or when we do not act at all; because these acts of commission or omission, shape and determine the future just as surely as if we were planning in the most positive sense. I propose to divide my remarks into three segments.

First, I will indicate what strikes me as some of the essential conditions that are likely to influence campus planning in both the near term and the long term future.

Secondly, I will identify some of the major pressures that I have observed that play upon institutions. Pressures which present themselves for recognition and incorporation in one way or another in the planning process, and therefore in the campus plan which results from it.

And third, I will outline a few criteria by which it might be reasonable to judge the ordering of our priorities to which the campus plan undertakes to give physical form, and the adequacy of the plan that is produced.

Let us then consider some of the conditions that are currently influencing campus planning now and are likely to be of more influence in the future. The first of these conditions has to do with the difficulty of identifying and sustaining the institutions objectives. The effort to secure greater certainty and precision in the statement of objectives, has not been a resounding success. There seems to be great difficulty in establishing an academic plan sufficiently precise to serve as guidelines and a shaping impulse to a comprehensive physical plan that will match the academic plan; where priorities are well understood and are agreed upon, where emphasis are clear and are matched by consensus in the community. It is essential to the planning process that there must be a clear statement of what institutional objectives are or should be. Broad general statements of institutional objectives do not form a sufficient basis for developing planning procedure. Precise objectives in institutions which by their very nature must have a substantial degree of dynamism in their make-up, is to pursue a 'will o' the wisp'. Therefore, the first condition which I find influencing campus planning is the constantly changing atmosphere in which it must take place.

A condition influencing community college planning particularly is the unique way that a community college reaches out to satisfy the educational and cultural needs of the area in which it is located. The range and variety of public service responsibilities over and above the educational needs of the fully registered student is different from the four-year college whose student body comes from everywhere. The community junior college is far more closely tied to its own locale. This relationship must be recognized and fully considered.

A third condition is the influence of cost upon both academic and physical planning. The present expenditures for education beyond high school are large and no doubt will be still larger in the years ahead. Americans demand a very high level of quality in education. And it may be some time before we persuade ourselves as a society to devote sufficient resources to these purposes in order to satisfy our desires. At any rate, the limiting factor of cost is a profoundly influential one. And our task as planners and educators in the face of these problems is to try to ensure not only that we execute our plans with decent economy, but also that we secure the maximum future human and educational values from rather stringently controlled current estimates of our needs. This is a tension which we already feel and which we are likely to feel more keenly in the future.

The last condition which I put forth has to do with planners and planning. Since planning is an institution-wide function, and since I remarked at the outset that everybody, for better or worse, is engaged in it, planning needs to be understood and undertaken on a genuinely institution-wide basis. This means, in my judgement, that far more members of the academic community than is now the case in most institutions, should know something about the principal techniques and problems of planning. Planners should be far more deeply involved with the academic community than they sometimes want to be. Separatism must be strictly limited in the interest of ensuring that the planning process reflects the thoughts, interests and desires of everybody, and is not restricted to those who are professionally qualified or designated for this role.

Let me turn to a few comments on some of the principal pressures playing upon institutions today, with some notes on the significance of these pressures for the planning process. I don't mean in talking about pressures to use a disparaging term. A pressure, after all, is potentially a priority, just waiting recognition in someone's official plan. And priorities on the whole are perhaps best seen as pressures which have been acknowledged and made legitimate.

The first institutional pressure in the academic and physical planning process is the inertia of the institution itself - the inertia in existing interests, activities and resources. What we are doing needs to be constantly reappraised. In making plans for the future, we sometimes assume what we are currently doing as a given, and then add on to that. The correct procedure, obviously, should not only be to survey and scrutinize proposals for new activities, but to survey and scrutinize what we are currently doing with a view to deciding whether or not we should continue to do it.

A second pressure which must be dealt with is just the opposite. It is the impulse to achieve new patterns and new directions. In this situation the planner and the educator, as they move between institutional continuity on one hand and the impulse to experiment on the other hand, view themselves sometimes as agents of change and sometimes as agents of continuity. I think neither term will fit a planner absolutely correctly. Correctness of the fit depends upon the context that he is working in at that moment.

The third pressure arises from the new discoveries, new technologies and new alignment of disciplines. These give our disciplines new opportunities, new obligations in their teaching, and new tools to work with which outmode the old. The impact, for example, of computer technology on academic planning and on physical planning is already imposing, and it is likely to be even greater in the years to come.

Finally, let me turn to a few criteria by which one might evaluate campus plans. The first criterion that should be used is; can the plan in fact be realized? This needs to be looked at hardheadedly in terms of economic feasibility, the resources it presumes to command and put at the institutions disposal, whether these be monetary, physical or human. Plans should be large, they should be appropriate, they should meet the future, but they are not likely to be anything save beautiful visions unless we are able to provide the means for their realization.

Second, can the plan be modified to take into account the developments that we cannot now foresee? I think there is a tendency among planners to believe that we can foresee the future a little more clearly than we actually can. If any one thing is characteristic today, it is that we could hardly have predicted twenty or thirty years ago, many of the things occurring today; yet the facilities in which they are going on were planned and developed many years ago. The best campus plans in the country have been susceptible to modifications to accommodate developments which were not and could not have been foreseen at the time the plan and the initial facilities in it were brought together. It is becoming increasingly clear that realistic and successful master planning must envisage a continuing expansion and change by others in the future. We must thoughtfully plan frameworks for the inevitability of growth and change which will create a unified complex, with its own special character, and which will provide an appropriate relationship to the educational plan, and to the community it serves. So we ought to test our plans by their susceptibility to significant growth and change and ensure that we can evaluate them and revise them in the light of experience and new discoveries.

My third criterion would be to ask whether the plan avoids commitment to a particular theory of education. One can design colleges around a particular theory, and one can design a campus around the theory which defines the college. Unless these are very limited purpose institutions, I think they are almost certain over the long run to fail, simply because we are dealing here with complexities of thought and attitudes which are not amenable, in my judgment, to permanent incorporation in a single theory or single physical expression. I would, therefore, think that the campus plan would imply or ensure a deliberate lack of fit between the current best thought, the current organization, the current scheme of doing things in the institution and the plan itself. The result would be a kind of creative tension between what we have available and what we need to work with so that we do not simply build into a permanent arrangement a given state of the art. Rather, we would ensure a flexibility to constructive thought for the future.

As a fourth criterion, I would ask whether the campus plan encourages the maximum number of impromptu encounters with other students, with other faculty members, with visitors, with books and with activities which one is not himself a regular part. I would ask whether the campus plan, directs, channels, concentrates, organizes, or whether it opens, suggests, allows, and implies, for those who are in it and affected by it. The efficiency of a campus plan is not merely to provide the physical setting in which the formal activities of the institution are to take place. Much of the education of anybody occurs outside of the classrooms, and only if the plan has the kinds of qualities which left to his own devices, the individual would not be likely to organize by himself, will the atmosphere which it produces be truly educational in the broadest sense.

Next, I would ask, does the campus plan simultaneously do two things with respect to the surrounding community? Does it establish the campus as something distinct and separate, as something special, something that you know you are in when you are in it, and not someplace else? And does it at the same time make the campus accessible and vital to the outside community, as a source of creativity radiating out to it? Is it in other words both itself and a part of the community that surrounds it?

Finally, I would put as a criterion of any campus plan - is it beautiful? Is it in fact capable of exerting a civilizing and humanizing influence on students and faculty and the community, apart from the direct influence of the curriculum. There is no real lobby for beauty and no distinct pressure for it. But the quality of life on a campus is profoundly influenced by the quality of the physical surroundings. This in turn imparts on campuses a quality to the entire activity, that will be missing if not enough attention is paid to esthetic considerations.

We are at a time when imaginative and bold planning is necessary to the future of educational institutions and through them to the future of our society. We are also at a time where careful planning is a difficult and complicated task. We have our hands full. I hope that together we will be able to produce the kinds of plans for our institutions which will produce in turn the kind of education that our society requires.

At the close of Mr. Fitch's remarks, Mr. Tompkins invited the fifty-plus members of the seminar to enter into a discussion of the questions raised by those remarks. Most of the questions raised and discussed centered about Item III, the criteria used to judge the priorities and to evaluate the resulting master plan:

1. Expand and discuss Item III-B. Flexibility is still the key word to master planning, but it has acquired a charged meaning, and Mr. Fitch has tried to avoid its usage. Still, any long range plan must allow for modification at any of the intermediate stages of growth. Primarily, college planners must allow for new programs through the use of movable partitions and non-specialized or "multi-purpose" spaces.

2. Expand on Item III-C. Planning must be dynamic, and dynamism requires that there be no irreversible commitment to particular teaching methods, theories, or philosophies. "To teach in a warehouse is the ultimate flexibility."

3. Planners must retain the confidence of their communities. Mr. Fitch advises selling bonds for the entire campus with an ample allowance for inflation, so that present planners or their successors won't have to go back to the voters at a later date for additional funds.

4. Expand and discuss Item III-F. How does one avoid the architectural "hodgepodge" found on the campuses of some of the older institutions? "Tastes change," said Mr. Fitch, "and the only real solution is to hire architects who are sensitive to the need for continuity and complement within change." Moreover, architects do not resent the requirement of compatability with older campus structures. Actually, no architect really wants to work in a vacuum, and most appreciate as many guidelines as their employers can give them.

5. Mr. Fitch reported that his firm frequently uses consultants, and they certainly do not resent the use of special consultants by their institutional employers. Wise planners seek all the specialized professional help they need to do the best job.

6. Expand upon and discuss Item III-D. Paths of learning must continually cross, or they will become barren and narrow. There should be as much "mix" as possible among students in the baccalaureate oriented and the occupation oriented programs in the college.

7. The problem of flexibility on a limited site is not really a different problem, says Mr. Fitch. It is the same problem as on a larger site, only more compact.

8. There was some disagreement on the use of an interim campus. Mr. Fitch advised against putting the interim buildings on the permanent site, since being so placed the interim buildings might easily become permanent. Some members of the group, however, believed very strongly that the potential use of two or more campuses for a period of eight to ten years might present logistic problems disproportionate to the risk of interim buildings becoming permanent. In either case, it was suggested that colleges lease or rent interim facilities rather than purchase them, since the State Board will likely charge any purchased square footage against the total square footage allowed to a college under the guidelines.

9. In relation to the limiting factors of cost and guidelines set down by the state board, Mr. Fitch remarked that his firm had found little problem in working with the state board guidelines on campus acreage and square footage allowances. Mr. Fitch had no specific comment concerning the guidelines relating to cost per square foot.

10. Mr. Fitch believed that ideally there should be a full-time architectural representative on the site at all times--hired either by the institution, by the architectural firm, or both. Where this is not possible, someone who knows construction well should be on the construction site as often as practical.

* * *

COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGES . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . .Evan Jackson
Director of Adult and Continuing Education, Illinois Central College

"The College and Community Agencies" . . . . Phillip R. Walker
Assistant Dean for Continuing Education, Parkland College

"Providing Services to Local Government" . . . . Salvatore G. Rotella
Dean of Occupational and Special Programs,
Loop Campus-Chicago City College

"Cooperative Programs with Business and Industry". . . . . . .Ashley Johnson
Dean of Continuing Education and Community Services,
Prairie State College

"Providing Community Cultural Programs" . . . . Reuben J. Johnson
Director of Community Services, Rock Valley College

Recorder . . . . Charles M. Medearis
Director, Continuing Education, Elgin Community College

COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGES

All of the speakers foresaw a wider area of community services for the junior college. Mr. Walker spoke of upgrading paraprofessional programs in order to relieve the skilled professional people of routine affairs. Mr. Rotella spoke on broadening services to local government. He indicated five areas for consideration: (1) Safety, (2) Social Service, (3) Engineering and Technical Services, (4) Administrative Services, and (5) Educational Services.

Mr. Rotella stated that he felt the place of the college was to do the educational work and the various agencies do the training in the particular function or skill. Each program would have within it three core areas: (1) A General Education core, (2) Public Service core, (3) Special core.

Mr. Ashley Johnson emphasized the cooperative nature of a program between the college and business and industry; that basic education experiences should be related to the job and that a sharing of the problem by business, education and industry would keep a person from being trained for a job that does not exist. He felt that a partnership with business and industry was necessary in order to provide opportunities for all levels and all groups; in order to solve and eradicate educational, economic and social problems.

Mr. Reuben Johnson stressed that in any cultural activities, cooperation with the community was essential. He cited several programs done by Rock Valley College in which a pooling of resources and talent resulted in a series of programs ranging from creative writer's group conferences to ecumenical services which could not have been done by the college alone.

* * *

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE SOCIO-ECONOMICALLY DEPRIVED . . . . .Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . .F. William Kelley
Dean of Instruction, Carl Sandburg College

Panel

R. David Gustafson Chairman, Division of Mathematics, Rock Valley College	Mary Ann Diller Dean, Adult Continuing Education, Danville Junior College
Joan W. Swift Director, Human Services Institute, Wilson Campus--Chicago City College	John T. Frey American Council on Education Fellow, Black Hawk College

Recorder . . . . Harry W. Abell
Acting Dean of Academic Affairs and Dean of Student Affairs,
Southeastern Illinois College

Summary

David Gustafson opened the panel by presenting a descriptive overview of the innovation of P.A.C.E. at Rock Valley College. P.A.C.E. is a program for attracting, counseling and educating students whose future prospects are not good. The program is especially structured to interest and attract students that have deficiencies to the extent usually that they might not otherwise seek a way to continue their education. Recruiting for the program is designed to reach students that have not before been reached.

Special attempts are made to assist the students in achieving some degree of early success through materials in programmed learning, individual tutoring and by encouraging the students to progress at their own rate. The curriculum designed to prepare the students to transfer to the regular college courses at the end of one semester or one year, depending upon their progress, include the following courses; Current Issues, Consumer Education, Human Relations, Communications Workshop, Physical Education and Studies in the Life Sciences.

Efforts are made within the courses to develop an awareness and to cultivate the student's interest. Contemporary problems of society are pursued by reading, following a discussion in Current Issues I, while the Communications Workshop uses a dictation unit which avails the student the opportunity to dictate, listen to his words, write, and finally receive personalized comments on the tape from his teacher. The course in Human Relations has as its objectives orientation to college life, discovering the students long range goals and improving the students self concept.

Mr. Gustafson expresses his optimism that P.A.C.E. at Rock Valley College is fulfilling in part a need basic to the philosophy of the comprehensive Community Junior College, which is to provide education for all who come to the Junior College.

Mary Ann Diller, Dean of Adult and Continuing Education, believes that Danville Junior College is unique: "in that it has a comprehensive training program for adults with less than a high school education." The program had its origin as an evening program in adult basic education for public aid recipients and was later expanded to a full day program for all adults needing basic education or needing vocational skills. The programs designed for adults are extremely flexible and totally non-graded. Dean Diller remarked that, "Students enroll every day of the school year since there are no formal beginning or ending dates." As an example of the individualized instruction given, she mentioned a mathematics class where an instructor is using thirty-one different textbooks with students working problems in simple fractions through trigonometry. It was further pointed out that the teachers meet every six weeks to evaluate and re-group students. Dean Diller also mentioned a program developed last year to provide academic and vocational education for the Spanish speaking Americans who live in the Junior College district.

The adult program is also very sensitive to the needs of high school dropouts. Dean Diller stated that "These students enjoy the atmosphere of the college campus and become accustomed to attending classes there."

Danville Junior College is providing programs to meet the needs of the educationally deprived adult, who quite frequently is also the socio-economically deprived, and looks forward to the continuance and improvement of the program.

The program of the Chicago City College, Wilson Campus, as described by Dr. Joan Swift, was not originally developed to meet the needs of the disadvantaged student and has not been limited in its appeal to this group. Dr. Swift stated, however that, "It has proved very successful with this population for a number of reasons; and, since many of the students come from disadvantaged backgrounds, has caused certain adaptations in the curriculum that might not have been necessary with other occupational programs." Students enrolled in the curricula are trained for work in a variety of related jobs in the fields of child care and social service. Present curricula include Child Development Programs in Preschool Education and in Residential Child Care, a Teacher Aide Program, and a Social Service Aide Program. Additional programs in Recreational Leadership and Mental Health Aide are in the experimental state.

Dr. Swift believes the career ladder concept is extremely important to the economically and socially disadvantaged students. She states that, "They are coming in the expectation that once they have completed their work successfully, they will be eligible to go on to the next step upward--vocationally and educationally. Dr. Swift further explained that the Wilson Campus is the site of two federally funded projects which are directed to the "socio-economically disadvantaged"--defined as those with family incomes falling within the poverty bracket. One is a twelve-week training program for unemployed or under-employed persons as Child-Care Attendants, while another project is known as the Head Start Supplementary Training Program, which is aimed at upgrading Head Start personnel, at both a professional and non-professional level. The latter program is a cooperative venture with Roosevelt University and Loyola University. Dr. Swift strongly believes that the Junior College can make significant contributions to the community through the development of "New Career" curricula following a Career Ladder Model.

The objectives of "the College Readiness Program" at Black Hawk College as outlined by Dr. John T. Frey are (1) To recruit members of minority groups to Black Hawk College, (2) To help them achieve greater understanding of college life and opportunities, (3) To increase their communicative skills and to help insure success in college.

Realizing the success of the innovation was dependent upon students, priorities were established with the approval of a lay advisory committee. The immediate priorities were (1) To recruit students for the program, (2) To solicit funds to provide tuition, books and supplies for the students and (3) To secure part-time jobs for the students.

In an effort to meet the immediate priorities, full-time students were employed under the College Work Study Program as recruiters and college tutors, matching the students and totors according to interests and area of residence. Support for the program was solicited through local school systems, welfare agencies and Chambers of Commerce to provide support through funds and/or by apprising potential students of the program. Twenty students began the program and seventeen of the twenty completed the Summer Session. Ten of these registered for the Fall Semester, indicating a somewhat successful conclusion to the first program.

* * *

ACADEMIC PREPARATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE FACULTY . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Edward J. Sabol
President, Sauk Valley College

"Master of Arts in Teaching" . . . . Theodore R. Kauss
Director of Master in Arts in Teaching, Northwestern University

"Junior College Point of View" . . . . William L. Stevens
Campus Dean, Bogan Campus--Chicago City College

"University Point of View" . . . . Richard R. Bond
Vice President of University;
Dean of Faculty, Illinois State University

Recorder . . . . Henry T. Boss
Associate Professor of Education,
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

Introductory Statement

One of the most frequently heard claims of the junior college, whether public or private, resident or community, is that teaching is our major function. With this statement comes the implication that our teaching is somehow superior not only to that of the secondary school but also to that of the lower division of the college and university. Another claim that we make is that of concern for individuals with a great variety of interests and a wide range of abilities.

In the years ahead, we will be seeking more and more faculty members who are superior classroom teachers and who, at the same time, are devoted to the personal aspirations of each student with whom they have contact. Today we are going to examine some ideas on the kinds of programs of preparation prospective faculty should receive. We could readily address ourselves to the following questions:

1. How important is strong subject matter preparation?

2. How much graduate study in the subject matter field is essential to the prospective teacher of freshmen and sophomores in college?

3. How much professional preparation in the science and art of teaching is needed for the particular kind of collegiate institution we claim to be?

4. How significant are all the prior questions for instructors in the occupational fields? And what is the relative importance of direct experience in an occupational field as compared with formal preparation for teaching?

Our seminar participants will bring us three points of view on preparation for junior college teaching. Collectively, I hope they can give us some inkling as to the best way to answer our questions on staff qualifications. Perhaps they can even help us decide whether we are actually doing a superior job of teaching, or just doing less research and writing than our university counterparts.

* * *

A Master of Arts in Teaching Program For the Professional Preparation of Junior College Instructors

Theodore Kauss

Many educational leaders in Illinois are deeply concerned with the problem of recruiting the well-qualified teachers needed to staff the state's proliferating junior colleges. Public and private universities could help mitigate this situation by developing a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) type program for the professional preparation of junior college instructors.

The format would include:

interdisciplinary courses;
an internship at a cooperating college;
a continuing professional seminar; and
an enriched master's degree with an open-endedness
  permitting doctoral studies for qualified students.

The Universities would provide the personnel, the facilities, and the organizational structure necessary to prepare these junior college instructors.

The following represent salient characteristics of this proposed college intern program affecting (1) the university, (2) the cooperating college, and (3) the intern:

The University

would attract competent, recent college graduates from across the nation;

would make a significant contribution toward alleviating the critical shortage of junior college instructors by providing selected liberal arts graduates an opportunity to enter the college teaching ranks via an appropriately designed internship;

would emerge as a leader in the movement to improve the preparation of college teachers. A unique program would be offered with research and methods offerings, and with a workshop approach to instructional media. The major emphasis of the program would be on thorough preparation of the intern in his teaching specialty.

The Interns

would complete graduate programs at universities with partial or full tuition remission, while receiving pro-rated salaries for part-time teaching in selected colleges;

would continue in scholarly research in their major disciplines at the Universities;

would be offered opportunities to observe and assist highly skilled college instructors;

would receive a variety of teaching experience in appropriate clinical settings.

The Cooperating Colleges

would be actively involved in preparing the junior college instructors needed during the next decade;

would be assisted by university personnel in locating and recruiting talented individuals for present and future assignments;

would derive some benefits from the diverse backgrounds and talents of those individuals attracted to the program;

could contract for full-time faculty positions those interns who exhibit the professional knowledge and skill desired by the institution, based upon actual performances of the interns as observed by faculty and administrators;

could use interns to relieve college instructors of various teaching and non-teaching assignments; intern combinations might be profitably blended in team-teaching situations;

would receive supervisory personnel and instructional materials from the university to aid and assist in the evaluation and improvement of intern teaching skills.

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, revealed in a recent address that five hundred new community colleges would be built in the next ten years, with 2,500 students on each campus. Dramatic evidence of this anticipated growth is revealed in A Master Plan--Phase II, September, 1966, by the Illinois Board of Higher Education:

> The rapid expansion of the junior colleges in Illinois will undoubtedly accommodate larger proportions of students enrolled in public institutions in the future. Currently 35.4 percent of the enrollees in public institutions in Illinois attend junior colleges. It is predicted this proportion will increase to nearly 58 percent by 1980.
>
> An argument against additional senior public colleges is that enrollments for the developing junior college system cannot be accurately assessed. One purpose of statewide planning is to prevent serious shortages of spaces for residents of Illinois. We cannot wait for the space crises to become critical before we initiate action requiring four or five more years to open new institutions.
>
> The junior colleges, by Committee M. projections, are to enroll 274,000 students by 1980, or 4 1/2 times the number enrolled in 1965-66. Under the most fortuitous of circumstances, including the full funding of all their constructions and operational costs, the junior colleges may be able to take care of that projected number of students. That increase in numbers, if it becomes a reality in such a short time, is greater than for any higher educational system in the United States. Moreover, the needs of the thousands of new students at upper-division and graduate levels cannot be cared for by two-year colleges.

These data support the contention that state and private universities can generate a program for preparing competent instructors for developing junior colleges. The need in Illinois is immediate.

Illinois is one of eight states having specific state requirements for the certification of junior college teachers. The current certification standards for junior college teachers in Illinois state:

> Faculty members should be selected and assigned on the basis of competency for the teaching duties to be performed. As a general rule, junior college teachers should hold a master's or higher degree with graduate specialization in the teaching field. The broad scope of programs offered in a junior college may include specialized courses in which the preparation for teaching varies from typical advanced degree

> programs and requires other educational preparation and experience. The test of competency should be related to required standards in the teaching field.[1]

The Mat-type format lends itself to existing regulations. There are no anticipated conflicts.

The two-year college and the four-year institution appear to be less receptive to educational innovations than most secondary and elementary schools. Nevertheless, new instructional media and techniques are being implemented to seek out various ways and means to enhance learning. The traditional format of the classroom is no longer an appropriate teaching medium for all purposes. Methods must be devised, developed and refined which will provide a more adequate foundation for approaching the broad sweep of diverse talents within the junior college population. A team-teaching approach which places an outstanding instructor in large lecture sessions can be effective. Competency on the lecture platform, however, often requires the implementation of learning aids and visual devices. The Illinois Junior College Board recognizes this need for improved methods and media of instruction:

> Unless some bold and imaginative steps are taken immediately, the quality of instruction in Illinois institutions will deteriorate rapidly. Given the number of people available in the field and those eligible to enter, it appears unlikely that the shortage of faculty can be met in sheer numbers. Other means must be found and used to make maximum use of the outstanding professors now in the university and college staffs to encourage the learning process in other than traditional classroom situation.
>
> Closed and open circuit TV, statewide educational television networks, team teaching, credit by examination and other techniques have proven successful in a wide variety of circumstances. Programmed instruction is already past its initial stages of development and other new means of speeding and perfecting the learning process are being considered.[2]

---

[1] The Illinois Junior College Board, Standards and Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of the Illinois Public Junior Colleges, adopted January 28, 1966.

[2] The Illinois Board of Higher Education, A Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois, July, 1964.

Again, the MAT-type format can easily embrace those experiences, both cognate and clinical, which encourage a departure from traditional programming.

Since many two-year colleges are unable to implement certain instructional procedures and provide the essential supporting services, it appears that the established four-year institutions must initiate programs of staff development for the junior colleges. The universities possess recources which can assist in the implementation of experimental in innovative instructional programs at colleges which cooperate with the universities' intern programs.

From these notations it appears that an internship program to prepare junior college instructors is not only feasible, but imperative. Universities in Illinois should venture forth in such a planned endeavor.

* * *

MASTER'S SEQUENCE

1st Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	2d Summer
Courses in Major 8 Professional Seminar (special methods, psychology, research techniques, micro-teaching) 0	Course in Major 4 Interdisciplinary selection 4 Professional seminar (instructional media) 0 Internship 0	Course in Major 4 Interdisciplinary selection 4 Professional seminar (junior college history and philosophy) 0 Internship 0	Course in Major 4 Statistics 4 Professional seminar (junior college curriculum theory) 0 Internship 0	Courses in Major 8 Professioanl seminar/independent study 0

DOCTORAL SEQUENCE (OPTIONAL)

Follow PhD requirements set by graduate school + non-credit professional seminars & continuing internship.

SUGGESTED FORMAT:

MAT.Junior College
Internship Program

Prepared by

Dr. Robert Miadment, Associate Dean
School of Education
Northwestern University

The Junior College Point of View

William L. Stevens

Summary

Mr. Stevens established two initial points:

1. He questioned if there is really a junior college point of view regarding the preparation of junior college faculty.
2. He presented the work of the Committee on "Preparation of College Teachers" within the Board of Higher Education which is moving through three phases:

   Phase I - Preparation of Junior College teachers

   Phase II - Preparation of Technical Program teachers

   Phase III - Preparation of Senior College Teachers

Regarding Phase I, he stated that the committee felt that the master's degree would be minimal, but not considered as professionally sufficient. Therefore, the committee has devised an intermediate, 6th year program/degree which appears to be more acceptable. Within the preparation program that this committee recommends is the inclusion of:

1. A seminar in the junior college which is considered vital, and which provides a philosophy, an overview, and enables the aspirant junior college teacher to "find himself."
2. A teaching internship which for those indicating the junior college would be in a cooperating junior college, and for those headed toward the senior college, it would be in such an institution.

* * *

University Point of View

Richard R. Bond

While my topic is from the university's point of view, I am going to presume to speak with two hats on, one of which is at least bi-cornered. The one hat is that of a member of the State committee on the preparation of college teachers; the bi-cornered hat is as chief academic officer of a university which on the one hand willingly receives junior college graduates who plan to complete their baccalaureate degrees with us and on the other hand also willingly assumes the responsibility of preparing college faculty both for junior and senior colleges. While I can presume to speak for the committee, since I have discussed my comments with them, I must point out that I cannot presume to speak for all universities, given their diversity. With these disclaimers, let me proceed to the questions at hand.

The committee on the preparation of college teachers is a joint effort of representatives of community colleges, four-year institutions and universities both publicly and privately supported. Gil Renner, Jim Spencer and Bill Stevens have been your effective representatives on that committee, and I am proud to say that it has truly been a joint effort of persons with diverse backgrounds and interests but with real dedication and a remarkable degree of unanimity. One of our over-riding concerns has been the avoidance of anything smacking of certification. We have unanimously and consistently felt that maximum freedom should be afforded both the institutions preparing junior college faculty and the junior colleges in their employment practices. It is only in this fashion that we can insure the possibility of innovation and creativity at both levels. It would be regrettable indeed if we overtly or inadvertently froze Illinois into a lock step which would do a disservice to the students whom we all serve. For these reasons, minimum guidelines which would hopefully assure both academic competence and an understanding of the teaching process were devised. You have heard now about our interim report adopted by the Board of Higher Education concerning the preparation of senior college teachers and teachers in the transfer programs of the junior colleges. Since there was unanimity on the committee that the junior and senior colleges are partners in higher education, it was concluded that the first two years of their programs should be roughly parallel and consequently the training of the teachers for the two types of institutions should differ mainly only in the extent of training necessary and the particular orientation desirable for the junior college teacher to understand the students and philosophy of junior colleges. In both instances, both strong academic preparation and an internship experience were recommended. The committee has been somewhat embarrassed that the circumstances necessitated our proceeding, for the convenience of one school awaiting approval of a program, with the teacher of liberal arts subjects first in what may have appeared to some to be a slight to the equally critical problem of the teacher of technical and occupational subjects. No such slight was intended. The committee is now completing its work on this important but exasperatingly complex question with the same degree of dedication and concern.

If this committee hat keeps slipping back on my head as I speak now of the university's point of view, it is simply because the two hats aren't far apart on my head. First of all, I should mention again my conviction that we are partners in the enterprise of higher education and that we should remember it both in words and in deeds--from personnel policies and practices including academic freedom to the commitment to quality teaching. We both have high stakes in this enterprise, but we must recognize that while those stakes are overlapping, they are not completely coincidental. We at the universities must recognize that junior colleges have a broader mission in terms of the range of the abilities and interests of the students they serve and respect them for it; and the junior college must recognize that we must take your transfer students and have them compete--hopefully without loss of credit and with minimum adjustment--with those who started with us. A recent study at Illinois State University confirms similar studies elsewhere that transfer students are satisfactorily making this transition.

Because they are slightly different and can be arbitrarily separable, let me speak separately, as our committee report did, to the issues of the training of your teachers in liberal arts programs and in vocational-technical programs. If I perceive the university viewpoint, it is that you should be looking for very similar academic qualifications for your faculty that we would expect for faculty we would hire to teach in our freshman and sophomore programs. You would be looking also, as would we, for persons who are teachers and whose commitment is to the student as well as to his subject. But you would be looking in addition for someone who understands the broader role of the junior college, its philosophy and the broader range of its student body. Since many of our teachers of freshmen and sophomores also teach upper division or even graduate courses, we would expect, for those who do, additional academic preparation. Let me summarize in specifics.

It would mean:

1. For both of us, academic preparation in the subject matter at least to the level of the master of arts or master of science degree.

2. For both of us, an understanding of the nature and evaluation of learning, the art and science of communication, and the philosophy of higher education, including for your teachers the nature of junior colleges, both through seminars and internship experiences under quality teachers.

3. For you, the option of the faculty member continuing his academic preparation beyond the master's as he desires.

4. For us, if the faculty member is going to teach at the upper division level also, the necessity of the doctorate or its equivalent.

It is doubtful to me that the first two goals can be reached within the ordinary master's degree program. For that reason, I am sympathetic to and supportive of the concept of a sixth-year program, whether it be called a Specialist in College Teaching or a Master of Arts in College Teaching, or some other name, in which both the subject matter preparation to the master's level and the specific higher education objectives can be adequately realized. Indeed, both we and other universities stand ready to offer such programs, but quite frankly, we must know that there is a market demand from you before we launch them. I would welcome general discussion of the merits of such a degree, for our plans for these programs at ISU await only the "go" sign from you.

It is doubtful to me also that either of us has approached these ideals. A recent survey of junior colleges in Illinois, for example, indicates that only about one-third of the persons teaching introductory economics have even a baccalaureate degree in economics. Similarly, the aspiration of good teaching at the university level has too frequently not been realized. We both need to look to our own houses.

The problem of the preparation of teachers for vocational-technical programs is a tougher nut to crack. Both the committee and we at the universities are sensitive to the problem, which is exacerbated by the very variety of fields subsumed under the name. For some, competencies may be measured by degrees; for others, even the first degree may be superfluous. The only generalizations which seem appropriate at this point seem to be these:

(1) The same understandings of higher education and the nature of the teaching-learning process as would be expected of the liberal arts teacher.

(2) An internship experience.

(3) Demonstration of competency in the field either by course work, degrees or plain proficiency where appropriate to the field.

The development of equivalencies in these fields will continue to be difficult and the solutions elusive. Perhaps all we can say today is that we continue to work at it, together where at all possible, with the universities assuming our contributory roles wherever proper for us and where we can be useful to you. For example, we at ISU are particularly concerned about this question in our college of Applied Science and Technology and will be in the health fields. Research centers in junior college problems, such as one included in our academic plan, may be helpful to you. Our continuous cautions as we work together toward these goals must be that we not let ourselves get hemmed in by yardsticks and rules which are irrelevant to the mission we share--the education of students.

* * *

General Comments from the Discussion Session

When the four-year institutions and universities commence preparing more and more junior college teachers, they should insure that their preparation programs reflect the diversity of teachers needed and provide different preparation programs.

Also, the universities should take into consideration how the environmental problems will affect the preparation of teachers. The requirement of a seminar in the junior college and related areas is absolutely essential.

The university should involve junior college people in the planning process of these programs. Also, as more transfer students enroll in future years, they'll want to return to the junior college to teach and more than likely will have the "junior college philosophy."

* * *

COORDINATION OF ADULT EDUCATION WITH OTHER COMMUNITY AGENCIES . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Robert F. Baker
Director, Continuing Education Division, Highland Community College

Address . . . . William S. Griffith
"Adult Education: The Challenge to the Junior College"
Chairman, Adult Education Committee, University of Chicago;
President-Elect, Illinois Adult Education Association

Reactors

David L. Ferris Dean of Continuing Education, Kankakee Community College	John W. Gianopulos Assistant Dean, Adult and Continuing Education, Amundsen-Mayfair Campus Chicago City College

Recorder . . . . A. Dale Musselman
Director of Adult Education, Kaskaskia College

Adult Education: The Challenge to the Junior College

William S. Griffith

The community junior college is the most rapidly proliferating institutional form in American higher adult education. From 1967 to 1968 the total number increased from 912 to 975, and an additional 200 are in an early stage of development.[1] Although currently there are no statistics available to show the extent of adult education activity in these institutions, several surveys suggest that community service including adult education is a rapidly growing aspect of community junior colleges.

Two trends favor the development of community college adult education: first, the steady increase in the number of community colleges; and second, the increase in the number of adults having the characteristics of adult education participants.

Currently one new junior college is established each week. "If the rest of the nation provides junior college services on the scale now achieved by states like California and Florida, there will be more than 850 public community colleges by 1970 as compared with just over 500 in 1965."[2] This estimate appears to be conservative.

---

[1] Telephone conversation with William S. Shannon, Associate Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges, August 26, 1968.

[2] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., ed. American Junior Colleges, 7th ed. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967), p. 32.

The number of adults who will be coming to various institutions to pursue educational goals is increasing at a more rapid rate than is the population. Today the typical adult education participant is young, urban, and fairly well educated. In the next few decades the number of persons having these characteristics will increase at a more rapid rate than will the population as a whole. During the next twenty years the total population will increase by about 33 percent while the number of adults under thirty-five years of age will increase nearly 70 percent.[1] Within twenty years the population will contain as many as 64 percent more adults who have been to college, 59 percent more who have attended high school, and 15 percent fewer with only a grade school education.[2]

The place of the junior college in adult education will also be influenced by the clientele it seeks to serve. For the most part adult educators have not been as successful in working with adults from lower socioeconomic levels as they have been in working with middle class clientele. Participation studies indicate that different groups in our society exhibit different levels of interest in learning opportunities. Persons in the lower socioeconomic groups apparently have as much or more spare time as persons in the higher socioeconomic levels. Yet, those who are in the lower groups do not characteristically turn to education as a way of using their spare time. It seems that the group which may expect to gain the greatest increase in leisure time due to automation is the group which has been least interested in adult education and which has the fewest resources for using the increased leisure constructively.[3] If community college adult educators should prove to be more successful in working with persons in the lower socioeconomic classes than adult educators typically have been, the importance of the community junior college in adult education will be even greater than projections based on past participation rates would indicate.

But not all forces are working together to support the continuing expansion of community junior colleges into adult education. Several forces will tend to oppose the development, and these must be considered in an analysis of the challenges which face the adult educator in the community college.

Forces Opposing Adult Education in Community Colleges

The words "adult education" mean different things to different people and it appears that the writers who have had something to say about adult education in the community college have an extremely restricted view. In one of the landmarks of the literature on the junior college, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect*, less than 5 percent of the pages are devoted to either community services or adult education. Medsker regards community service as a broad term which encompasses "the various special services which an educational institution may provide for its community. Examples of such services are workshops, forums and institutes; research and advisory assistance to community groups; cultural and recreational activities, including community music and theater groups; and widespread use of the college plant for community activities." . .[1] Adult education in his view is evidently one type of community service consisting of nothing more than credit or noncredit classes offered for other than the regular full-time students.[2]

---

[1] John W. C. Johnstone and Ramon J. Rivera, *Volunteers for Learning: A Study of the Educational Pursuits of American Adults* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), p. 19.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 20.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 22.

For the purposes of this paper the term adult education will be regarded as "a relationship between an educational agent and a learner in which the agent selects, arranges, and continuously directs a sequence of progressive tasks that provide systematic experiences to achieve learning for those whose participation in such activities is subsidiary and supplemental to a primary productive role in society."[3]

The essential distinction between community service and adult education is that in an educational activity the goal is a change in the knowledge, skill, or attitude of one or more learners. In a service activity an agent makes his skill available, much as a TV repair man, without making any pretense that he is trying to teach anybody anything. To the extent that an institution has education as its central function, service activities occupy a secondary position.

The narrow view of adult education which appears in the junior college literature evidently springs from the prevailing tendency of educators in the public school system to equate education with conventional classroom instruction. To the extent that the restricted definition of the word is used, those who are responsible for developing adult education programs will cover the entire range--from A to B. The state of adult education in the junior college reflects the relative newness of this function.

Adult education is one of the newer functions of the junior college and as such is less well understood than the transfer function which dominated the interests of junior college leaders for the first quarter of this century and which may still be seen as the only academically respectable function by some faculty members. For the second quarter of the Twentieth Century terminal education came to the attention of an increasing number of junior college administrators. For the most part, however, the terminal function is still second in importance to the transfer function. Since World War II adult education and community service have been emerging. Accordingly, many of the problems associated with the indefinite place of adult education within the institution may be attributed to the youthfulness of the program compared to the terminal and transfer programs.

It should be noted that the restrictive definition of adult education was not endorsed or imposed by the Illinois State Legislature on the junior colleges of Illinois. In its wisdom, the Legislature simply endorsed "adult education" and left the job of defining it to those who write the legislative guidelines and serve on the Illinois Junior College Board. Despite the reluctance of the legislators to adopt a restrictive definition of adult education, if junior colleges reflect public school outlooks, the tendency to equate classroom instruction with adult education will persist.

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960), p. 78.

[2] Ibid., p. 73.

[3] Coolie Verner, "Definition of Terms," Adult Education eds. Gale Jensen, A. A. Liveright, and Wilbur Hallenbeck (Washington, D.C.), Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1964), p. 32.

A second reason the narrow definition of adult education will tend to persist is that little imagination or educational leadership is required to offer an "extended day" program. It is not very difficult to offer the same courses at night as are offered during the day, but it is not very innovative to call these classes held after 5:00 P.M. "adult education." The narrow definition will tend to persist, then, because it is the path of least resistance and it provides a convenient way of avoiding accepting any responsibility for educational leadership in the college and the community.

A third factor which tends to restrict the fullest development of junior college adult education programs is ill-conceived state reimbrusement schemes. In some circumstances it is possible to get more money from the state if a course is offered under the sponsorship of a junior college than if the same course were taught in identical fashion to the same students by the same teacher under high school sponsorship. Citizens might well question the wisdom of officials who promulgate such regulations. State subsidization which favors the movement of a course from a high school adult education program to a junior college adult education program may not be in the public interest.

One might also want to take a hard look at the practice of designating a high school as an extension center of a junior college where it appears that all of the junior college adult education program is conducted in high schools and where it appears that the program in the cooperating high schools has not changed appreciably following the affiliation. Tax supported financial incentives for moving existing courses from high schools into junior colleges will tend to retard the development of community adult education opportunities both by discouraging the public school adult education administrator and by tying up the junior college resources in efforts that might better be engaged in developing new programs for unmet needs. Professional adult educators and junior college administrators who are interested in the development of comprehensive community adult education must keep a close watch on legislation relevant to the junior college and also on the administration of the legislation if they want to insure that state support programs support rather than hinder that development.

A fourth factor which will militate against the fullest development of junior college adult education is the provincialism of some adult educators in other institutions. Presumably the most comprehensive program of adult education in each community would be facilitated by the discussion among educators in relevant institutions of the ways in which they can cooperate. At the present time the responses of the established associations in adult education to the emerging junior college adult education role are about as throughtful and disciplined as the demonstrations and the police behavior in Chicago during the Democratic Convention. The major organizations--the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., The National Association for Public School Adult Education, the National University Extension Association, and the Association of University Evening Colleges are all jockeying for position to see who can enlist the largest number of junior colleges or junior college adult educators as members. Local level adult educators in established programs typically carry out their responsibilities giving little thought to the coordination of activities or to the problems of the total community as a client. Even where adult education councils exist they seldom engage in cooperative program planning. The extent of their efforts is frequently limited to the sharing of information concerning program decisions made at the individual institutional level.

The fifth limitation to the fullest development of junior college adult education to be discussed in this paper is the background and experience of junior college adult education administrators. A study of 394 public junior colleges in 1963[1] reported there were 127 adult education administrators in these institutions and that 73.8 percent of them were employed full time. The directors had come from various positions: 10.3 percent had been hired from other junior colleges; 31.0 percent had come directly from elementary or secondary schools; 11.1 percent had come from senior colleges and universities; and 41.2 percent had come from other positions in the junior college in which they were employed at the time of the study. At some point in their careers 42.0 percent of the directors had worked in primary or secondary schools. A majority of the directors had master's degrees (73.8 percent); 21.4 percent had doctorates; and 4.8 percent had bachelors degrees. More than half of the directors, 55.5 percent, had had administrative experience in their previous positions. Virtually none of the directors had come to his position with academic preparation in adult education.

Adult education in the junior college has typically erupted rather than evolved. It is not unusual that directors have been recruited from a variety of backgrounds. The influence of the public schools in shaping the directors' perception of adult education as conventional classroom teaching is reflected in the literature on junior college adult education.

Harlacher, President of Brookdale Community College in Lincroft, New Jersey, studied the community service and adult education programs of junior colleges for the American Association of Junior Colleges. Much of what he chose to call community service would be called adult education by professors of adult education. In November, 1967, he recommended that the Association support leadership training programs for community services personnel; encourage leading universities to establish leadership training programs for community services personnel; host a national conference on community services; and encourage regional and state-wide workshops and institutes on community services.[2] The argument posed by this report appears to be that the fullest development of adult education in the junior college will require preservice and in-service education for the adult education administrators and continuing learning opportunities regarding adult education for university administrators and trustees in workshops and institutes.

The challenge to the junior college adult education program arises primarily from the five factors which have been presented. Five action steps may be suggested.

---

[1] Wayne L. Schroeder and Dunnovan L. Sapienza, "The Public Junior College Adult Education Administrator," Adult Education, XV, No. 4 (Summer,1965),pp. 241-245.

[2] Ervin L. Harlacher, The Community Dimension of the Community College, Report to the American Association of Junior Colleges (Oakland, Michigan: Oakland Community College, November, 1967), pp. 178-179.

Approaches to Improving Adult Education in Community Colleges

The first of the five steps to be taken in meeting the challenge of adult education in the junior college is the initiation of action to counteract the forces which are tending toward a premature crystallization of the image of junior college adult education. As has been shown, the prevailing practice seems to be that of regarding adult education as consisting of only those programs involving classroom teaching. If adult education is to consist of a comprehensive community oriented program, then chief administrators and governing board members will require information to assist them in conceptualizing junior college adult education. One of the distinctions to be emphasized is between adult education activities designed to increase the knowledge, skills, and understanding of adults, and community service activities in which no learning need take place on the part of the participants.

The second step to be taken by the junior college adult educator is that of strengthening all of the existing agencies of adult education in his community. To date attempts to develop effective adult education councils or other coordinating organizations have usually been unsuccessful. Accordingly any coordination or cooperation among adult educators in different institutions serving the same area is likely to be haphazard and unsystematic. Typically, persons who have found themselves unexpectedly named as adult educators have attempted to start a program or to perpetuate an existing program without making a serious effort to assess the existing adult education opportunities in their communities. In most American communities there is no agency or office an adult can go to to obtain information on educational programs for adults being conducted in that community. Although each adult program administrator is interested in bringing his program to the attention of potential students, it is rare for adult educators as a group to cooperate in establishing an information center designed to serve the public needs from the standpoint of the individual adult seeking learning resources.

Because the provision of information to the adults in the community regarding learning opportunities is a function which is characteristically handled poorly if at all, the junior college adult educator has an opportunity to provide this service and in so doing earn the appreciation of adult educators in all institutions and of adults who use the service. The establishment of an adult learning opportunities clearinghouse by an administrator of a junior college program will work to his advantage in several ways. First, he will gain favorable public recognition for his providing the service. Second, he will become acquainted with all of the adult educators working in his area as he travels around meeting them and collecting information on their programs. Third, he will increase his knowledge of the work of each agency and its potential and therefore will become better able to plan a program which is addressed to unmet educational needs in the community. The community junior college adult educator who seeks to facilitate the development of a comprehensive community oriented adult education program will find that he is accepting a role which adult educators in other institutions have abdicated. He will have to show a new way to those who have worked in adult education longer than he has. He will have to surmount the tendency to regard community needs from the standpoint of what would be in the immediate best interests of his institution. He will have to exemplify a high standard of professionalism so that other adult educators may be persuaded of the merit of his approach and thus be induced to emulate his behavior.

The third step to be taken is that of building a program which does not unnecessarily duplicate existing offerings of other institutions and one which builds upon the unique resources of the junior college. Fisher emphasized that "the nature of the adult education program depends largely on the needs of the community and the nature of programs offered by other institutions in the community. In many areas, the public school board operates a night school providing high school courses and a wide range of general interest courses. In such cases there is no need for the junior college to duplicate the offerings and it can concentrate on higher level courses."[1]

If he is to build a community educational program which draws upon the unique resources of his institution then an adult educator must become familiar with the special abilities of the staff of his institution. Only to the extent that he is aware of his resources can he determine the capability of the junior college to provide learning opportunities which are relevant to community needs.

In the fourth step the junior college adult educator approaches the community in a special way. Rather than thinking exclusively in terms of offering opportunities for each individual to get assistance in working toward his own personal goals, the community oriented adult educator will not deny his responsibility to exercise educational leadership. He will make his own assessment of community problems, and working with an advisory committee wherever possible, he will develop educational programs which will increase the capacity of the individuals involved to deal with the problem situation more adequately than they could have done otherwise. Although the community oriented adult education director is concerned with helping adults work toward the attainment of their socially acceptable goals, he is not content to stop at that point. Instead, he may develop programs to bring problems to the attention of people who were previously unaware of them. His concern is primarily with influencing the quality of life in the community through improving the ability of individuals and groups to participate intelligently in the decision-making processes of the community.

In the fifth step to be taken in meeting the adult education challenge to the junior college, the administrator directs his attention conciously and deliberately to his own continuing adult education. Through a systematic program of reading; professional memberships; attendance at selected local, state and national meetings; participation in workshops; and through pursuing graduate study in adult education; the professional adult educator in the junior college will remain abreast of new developments in the field not only in junior colleges but in all kinds of adult education institutions. A man who is not serious about his own continuing education is incompetent to provide effective leadership in junior college adult education.

Concluding Statement

In this paper it has been shown that the increasing number of community junior colleges and the changing characteristics of the adult population constitute a situation which is conducive to the expansion of the size and scope of junior college adult education. Five forces were identified, however, which will tend to restrict junior college adult education acitivity to conventional, pedestrian, classroom-oriented programs. The junior college adult education administrator is the key person in determining whether the favorable forces will be utilized and the unfavorable forces neutralized or overcome. Five action steps were proposed for junior college adult educators who are eager to meet the challenge of developing a fully comprehensive community-based program of adult education.

---

[1] Grant L. Fisher, Major Issues in Community College Organization (Calgary: Department of Educational Administration, The University of Calgary, 1967), pp. 63-64

Leadership is not conferred--it must be earned. The junior college adult educator who has developed a well thought-out plan of community oriented education and who can demonstrate the soundness of that plan to the officers of his institution, to his counterparts in other institutions offering adult education, and to the public he seeks to serve will find that the mantle of leadership will be placed on his shoulders. The challenge to junior college adult education is clear. What is needed now are the men who have the vision and are ready to lead the way.

* * *

Reactions - David L. Ferris

In his opening remarks, Dr. Griffith stated that the number of junior colleges has increased greatly in the past two years. Kankakee Community College is one of the 63 new institutions that has already been established in 1968. My remarks in reaction to Dr. Griffith's presentation will be as it relates to my own institution.

In this rapidly developing situation, perhaps some assessment of present offerings and future plans in the junior college adult education program might help. Would it be possible for the American Association of Junior Colleges or some other agency to sponsor a survey instrument which would be concerned with adult education activities in the junior colleges? The results of this original survey and perhaps a couple of follow-up surveys could be made available to all junior college adult educators. This would assist in evaluation of present programs and development of future offerings.

Dr. Griggith listed two factors he felt affected the probability of expansion of adult education in the junior colleges--(1) the continued increase in the number of junior colleges, and (2) the increased number of adults who will be seeking educational opportunities. I believe the Illinois Junior College Act and its requirements concerning adult and continuing education is a third factor which affects the spread of adult education offerings.

With an increase in the number of adults over 35 years of age comes an increase in the number of adults that desire more educational opportunities in credit and non-credit classes in both vocational and avocational interest areas.

I partially agree with Dr. Griffith's statement concerning lack of real success in working with adults from the lower socio-economic levels. However, I believe progress is being made in this area. Basic education literacy and Americanization classes are being established in ghetto areas. Federal title programs, Economic Opportunity Act, Head Start, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Public Aid programs are all making progress in meeting the needs of adults in the lower socio-economic class. For the first time many of these people are given a chance to experience success.

Medsker's book, "The Junior College: Progress and Prospect" was written in 1960. Since that time, adult education has grown in importance and scope. This is especially true in Illinois since the Public Junior College Act.

The definition of adult education given by Dr. Griffith was a good definition but something more workable is needed--a short definition that can be accepted by all concerned with adult education. I suggest the following definition: "Adult education is an educational service program organized for adults."

Adult education must go beyond the conventional classroom instruction. It involves community services, workshops, seminars, and other activities. Many of these activities would be of a short term nature.

The "insecure place of adult education within the institution" points out the need of proper communications. We must communicate the importance of adult education to all members of the faculty and to the community as well.

Capable leadership is also necessary to overcome the narrowness of adult education. This leadership must be creative, innovative, and imaginative in the adult education programs. The "extended day" program being labeled adult education does lack imagination on the part of the adult education director, but is it not possible for the after 5 P.M. program to be a part of the adult and continuing education program? We need to use community service approach to program planning. We must strive to satisfy the wants and needs of the community.

I believe it is a good idea to designate the high schools as extension centers of the junior colleges. In my opinion there are a number of advantages to this neighborhood school concept. It permits lower tuition rates and enables more persons to participate in the program. It covers more territory. In Kankakee Community College it involves ten school districts instead of one, it includes parts of six counties rather than merely a part of one county. It is also a status symbol to have junior college courses offered at a local high school for the privilege of local citizen attendance.

I heartily agree there is a need for a more cooperative attitude among the professional adult education associations. There is a need for a catalyst to accomplish this. Perhaps one member from each of these organizations could become members of a National Adult Education Council. The American Association of Junior Colleges and the National Association for Public School Adult Education are cooperating in a pre-conference meeting at Seattle, Washington, from November 7-11, 1968.

The situation concerning lack of specific training by adult educators is being changed. At the Illinois Adult Education Roundtable, a showing of ideas and programs enable the deans and directors to add additional adult education courses to improve their program. The University of California, Northern Illinois University, University of Illinois, and others are all offering programs for both in-service and pre-service training of adult educators.

I would agree, for the most part, with Dr. Griffith's list of five forces which tend to restrict junior college adult education programs. The five action steps he proposed to meet these challenges were very good and worthy of being implemented. His concluding statements were worth repeating---

"Leadership is not conferred--it must be earned. The junior college adult educator who has developed a well thought-out plan and who can demonstrate the soundness of that plan to the officers of his institution, to his counterparts in other institutions offering adult education, and to the public he seeks to serve will find that the mantle of leadership will be pressed on to his shoulders. The challenge to junior college adult education is clear. What is needed now are the men to lead the way."

* * *

Adult Education: A Challenge to the Junior College

John W. Gianopulos

I am in a unique position, having the opportunity to react to our speaker's address and also to react to the reactor who reacted to the speaker's address. However, for the sake of brevity, I will limit my reactions to Professor Griffith's remarks.

Mr. Griffith has told us that adult education in junior colleges is likely to experience a major increase in size over the next two decades. He identified five forces which he felt would tend to restrict junior college adult education activity to conventional, pedestrian and classroom oriented programs.

First, I would like to take issue with his definition of adult education. Blakely believes that a satisfactory definition is impossible. London and Wenkert suggest that there is a tendency to define adult education by what one feels it should be and that adult education is so amorphous and diverse that it is difficult to define it precisely. You should know, however, that the Illinois Junior College Board has formally adopted a statement on the scope of adult education in their publication Standards and Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of Illinois Public Junior Colleges. The statement follows: "The scope of adult education includes all continuing education and community service programs which may contribute to the educational and cultural needs of the community. Programs offered in this area are designed to serve persons of post-high school age who are primarily part-time students.

Such programs may include formal or informal learning experiences offered on either a credit or non-credit basis that help serve the cultural, civic, recreational, educational and/or vocational interests of the community."

Kempfer warns of the danger in defining adult education in terms of individual services. He says, "Adult education in focusing upon the individual has too often been concerned with little needs. If harnessed to total improvement of our communities and our democracy, it will be harnessed to big needs." This implies a close relationship between adult education as formal class work provided to individuals, and adult education as educational service to the community or groups within the community. In the latter case, the college becomes a "catalytic force" to supply leadership, coordination, and cooperation necessary to stimulate action programs by individuals and groups within the community. These "community services" are educational, cultural and recreational services which a college may provide for its community over and beyond regularly scheduled day and evening classes.

Specifically, our speaker has defined adult education as a relationship between an educational agent and a learner in which the agent selects, arranges and continuously directs a sequence of progressive tasks that provide systematic experiences to achieve learning for those whose participation in such activities is subsidiary and supplemental to a primary productive role in society. Although there is no indication as to the nature of this relationship, let us assume, for the sake of this discussion, that it is indeed a positive relationship and that it does have some positive effect on learning. I do find it difficult, however, to accept the educational agent as one who does the selecting, arranging and directing of the learners' tasks. I rather think that there must be some involvement on behalf of the learner, the community, and the subject matter to be learned as indicated by Ralph Tyler's rationale.

Next, I agree with Professor Griffith that some of the state reimbursement schemes may have a stifling effect upon the fullest development of junior college adult education programs. However, I am pleased to note that since February, 1968, adult education has received state reimbursement on a semester hour equivalency equal to that of the academic program. I am hopeful that the state board will expand their horizon of approved courses and will attempt to liberalize their interpretation of the current policy concerning auditors.

Another factor noted by our speaker militating against the fullest development of junior college adult education is the provincialism of some adult educators in other institutions. He notes that the major organizations, the AEA of the USA, NAPSAE, AAJC and others are all jockeying for positions to see who can enlist the largest number of junior college adult educators.

Comprehensive community adult education program planning to be effective, should be cooperatively planned at the operational level which primarily involves the local community college. Here, I agree with Harlacker, in that the community college campus should be coterminous with the entire area the college serves. Chicago City College cannot and must not be confined to the square block allocated to most of its eight campuses, but must be made available to all three and a half million residents occupying the entire city which, in effect, becomes our campus. It is important to begin some meaningful dialogue at all levels. We cannot sit here and expect AEA, NAPSAE, AAJC and others to develop a system of communication for us.

Communication, according to Barnard, is considered so important to organization that it is said "The first executive function is to develop and maintain a system of communication." Upon the establishment of an effective communication system depends the quality of decision-making in an organization, for this latter function is related to the amount of information available concerning the issues under consideration.

Many of us in this room belong to more than one of the above mentioned national organizations not for the purpose of enlisting the largest number of colleagues, but rather to become informed on major issues under consideration in adult education.

The last force identified by our speaker which he termed as the most important major limitation to the fullest development of junior college adult education is the background and experience of junior college adult education administrators. Our speaker quoted a study which indicated that virtually none of the directors came to their positions with academic preparation in adult education.

I would like to remind Mr. Griffith that advanced graduate degrees in adult education first appeared on the academic scene 34 years after Joliet Junior College was founded and 24 years after Chicago City College came into existence.

However, I agree with Professor Griffith that for too many years we have been shackled to the common school district approach. Some of us perhaps, haven't taken off the horse binders and therefore, cannot look at the total Gestalt.

Five action steps were proposed for junior college educators who are eager to meet the challenge of developing a full comprehensive community based program of adult education.

The first step dealt with communications with chief administrative officers and board members. Although House Bill 1710 mandates 15 percent of our total offerings in adult education, we must get a philosophical commitment to this concept beginning at the very top.

The suggestion of an adult learning opportunity clearing house similar to Eric Clearing House on Adult Education sponsored by Syracuse University, but at a local community level, has good possibilities.

Another action step proposed by Mr. Griffith deals with building a program which does not duplicate existing offerings of other institutions and one which builds upon the unique resources of the junior college.

I would like to take a moment and suggest some basic programs of community services which, according to Harlacker, should provide for the following:

1. Community use of college facilities.

2. Community educational services.

3. Cultural and recreational activities.

4. Institutional development.

The effective administration and supervision of the program of community services involves:

8

1. Securing community--college support.
    - A. Involve community in planning and development.
    - B. Maintain effective internal and external communication.
    - C. Involve faculty and students in planning and development.
    - D. Coordinate services with other community groups.
    - E. Encourage college staff to participate in community affairs.
    - F. Orient faculty and staff to community service functions.
2. Determining nature and scope of program.
    - A. Provide effective planning and research.
    - B. Establish high standards for public performances.
    - C. Tailor services to specific needs and interests.
    - D. Define program purposes and objectives.
    - E. Identify community needs and interests.
3. Organizing and administering program.
    - A. Provide effective administration and supervision.
    - B. Establish and adhere to written policies, regulations, and procedures.
    - C. Utilize community facilities and resources.
    - D. Secure board, administration, and faculty support.

Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, in their new book, The Academic Revolution, have raised some serious issues with regard to the community college--especially its faculty. "While community colleges have not been tied to traditional academic definitions of appropriate qualifications for teaching," they write, "neither have they been especially imaginative in utilizing new kinds of instructors. Like their public school cousins, they have often insisted on just enough academic certification to bar the employment of gifted amateurs from other occupations."

They also accuse community college faculty of generally perpetuating what they term "a quite rigid pattern of instruction." They say: "Most community college instructors continue to teach what they were taught in four-year colleges, immunized from new ideas both by isolation and by the prestige of the models they are emulating."

They further state that: "While the community college may in principle exist to serve new sorts of students and offer new sorts of programs, most faculty and administrators are still primarily interested in traditional academic programs and in students who will eventually transfer to a four-year college."

We, as community college adult educators are obviously closest to our own home situations, and thus, in the best position to judge the relative weight that should be given to these criticisms.

It seems inevitable that the Community College will place even greater emphasis on its community dimension in the decade ahead. I believe the community college will demonstrate, to an extent even greater than it has to date, that the college is where the people are. Community services in the future will be scheduled around the clock, seven days a week, 52 weeks a year, in order to realize the "Impossible dream."

Adult education is much, much more than taking what is on-campus off. We need to do more than extend campus courses to off-campus locations. We need creative new programs, different approaches and techniques, and new dimensions.

In closing, I am reminded of the words of Gerald Smith, Executive Secretary of the Illinois Junior College Board, who said: "The potential extent, breadth and scope of adult education is limited only by the amount of imagination, enthusiasm and energy that is directed toward this important function of the community college."

The challenge, that Dr. Griffith has given, lies before all of us.

* * *

Responses Made by the Audience Attending the Session on Coordination of Adult Education with Other Community Agencies

Mr. John Tucker raised a philosophical question concerning adult education program offerings, "Do we give adults what they want or what they need?"

Dr. Griffith responded by stating that we begin with what they want, but we must not stop there.

A representative of the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction said he would like equal time to defend his office. He stated O.S.P.I. was most anxious to increase the rate of reimbursement made to adult education programs. He asked for support and cooperation from all concerned to get this accomplished.

Another gentleman emphasized the importance of proper communications. In setting up adult education programs, communications is a most vital part. He found that communication with the top administration was just a beginning. Often better results may be achieved by discussion with people in secondary roles.

* * *

ROLE OF ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD WITH OTHER STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . William K. Ogilvie
Coordinator, Community College Services, Northern Illinois University

Panel

Kenneth H. Lemmer
Legal Counsel, Illinois Junior College Board

Virgil H. Judge
President, Lake Land College

Frank F. Fowle
Chairman, Illinois Junior College Board

Gerald W. Smith
Executive Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board

Discussion

Recorder . . . . William E. O'Brian
Academic Dean, Kishwaukee College

Introduction

William K. Ogilvie

Dr. Ogilvie, in very brief introductory remarks, indicated that the Illinois Junior College Board must operate in relationship to other boards and agencies. The Board cannot operate as a sole and independent corporate body. Dr. Ogilvie then introduced Mr. Virgil Judge.

A. Mr. Virgil Judge - Mr. Judge commented that the Illinois Junior College Board has played its role very well in making decisions to implement the Junior College Act. The Illinois Junior College Board has acted to keep all inter-agency relationships smooth and amicable. In relation to the several colleges, the Illinois Junior College Board has been invaluable as an evaluative agency. In addition to evaluation, the Illinois Junior College Board has both policy making and legislative functions, adjusting inter-agency relationships and urging legislation of benefit to junior college education. Mr. Judge suggested that all forms be standardized by the Illinois Junior College Board, and this request became a recurrent theme throughout the meeting and the day. The text of Mr. Judge's presentation is as follows:

First, may I comment that whatever that role is, it is my opinion that the Illinois Junior College Board is playing it very well, in fact I think exceptionally well.

To have made innumerable decisions within the past three years on many major issues in implementing the Junior College law with such a small amount of friction, seems to me to be most worthy of note. It is true there has been dissatisfaction here and there, but on the whole it has been very small in relation to the many accomplishments that have been effected.

It takes open communication and consideration of the views of others to keep a smooth working relationship among the various groups involved.

To keep as much local autonomy as possible and still keep within the guidelines established by the Junior College law, requires a high degree of understanding among all concerned.

The role of the Illinois Junior College Board as a regulating agency of the junior college system is to study, plan, coordinate, set standards and evaluate the quality of the state public junior colleges. With such a broad and carefully defined responsibility to the junior colleges together with its responsibility to the Board of Higher Education, the Federal government, and the many other agencies such as North Central Association, Office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the State Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, it becomes obvious that the formation of policies to meet its obligations and to communicate these to all concerned, requires time and a well organized means of communication.

In addition to the role of the Illinois Junior College Board as a regulating agency, it also performs a most important role in making studies of the needs of the junior colleges and then preparing and presenting legislation to help meet the needs. Pursuing junior college bills through the legislature is time consuming and arduous but an extremely valuable service to the junior colleges.

As far as the junior college presidents are concerned, Mr. Smith has given us every opportunity to share our ideas with him and to react to his ideas before they become policy through meetings with the Presidents' Advisory Committee. This Committee meets about every month for the greater part of a day. This type of association has been very effective in reaching consensus on many important decisions; at least if agreement is not reached, each president knows the rationale for the decision that was made. I don't recall a time when there has been a cloture on debate.

At times there are those who believe the Illinois Junior College Board perhaps takes the law too literary, as Lum Edwards used to say. The greater part of this type of questioning is in the area of restricting local autonomy.

If the local district is to continue to show initiative and creativity, it must be given as much local autonomy as the law will permit yet function as a part of a coordinated state system of higher education.

We would like to see the Illinois Junior College Board bring together all the various reporting forms from all boards to whom we must report, designed to get the same basic information, and prepare identical forms, as nearly as possible.

It is often quite disconcerting to be required to reorganize facts to fill out reports which end up with the same information.

Appreciation is extended to Gerald's office for all its assistance in coordinating applications and reports with the State Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. Many feel the paper work required by the Board of Vocational Education is superfluous and more varied in nature than should be necessary, however it is realized that the Federal Government is partially responsible.

It is hoped different reports to different State Boards would be kept to an absolute minimum.

In conclusion - after a few years of experience and all the territory in Illinois is quietly tucked away in a junior college district, I can see quite a high level of sophistication and coordination smoothly operating among the Illinois Junior College Board and other state and federal agencies, including local districts. In my opinion a tremendous job has been done to this point.

B. Mr. Gerald Smith - Mr. Smith suggested that the group ready itself for a discussion session. The role of the Illinois Junior College Board to the several agencies is about the same as that of the individual colleges to the several agencies.

1. Junior colleges, though they have local boards, are, nonetheless, State colleges in the same manner as is Northern Illinois University.

2. The primary relationship of the Illinois Junior College Board is to the Board of Higher Education.

3. The structure of the Illinois system is really that of a "system of systems."

4. Members of the "system of systems" are Board of Higher Education, Board of Regents, Trustees of the University of Illinois, Board of Governors, Trustees of Southern Illinois University, and the Illinois Junior College Board.

In their relationships, agencies act in concert. The Illinois Junior College Board also has a relationship, though not as close as those above, to many State and Federal offices. Finally, the Illinois Junior College Board is a planning, service, and evaluation agency.

C. Mr. Kenneth Lemmer - Since the legislature has set out (IJCB) relationships, we can not legally avoid or evade them. All systems must be fitted together so as to act as a unit. The Illinois Junior College Board is loosely related to such diverse offices as county clerk, county treasurer, high school districts, general public, Superintendent of Public Instruction, junior college administrators, the auditor, and the Board of Higher Education.

The statutes mandate some relationships and not others, but all are important to the functioning of the Illinois Junior College Board. The Illinois Junior College Board operates up and down in its dealings with other agencies; i.e., toward both higher and lower levels of educational enterprise. Most important non-mandated relationship is to the Health, Education, and Welfare Department of the Federal government.

Then followed a brief period of observations, expansions, and questions.

OBS. Administrator observed that there are simply too many forms to fill out; asked the Illinois Junior College Board to start an inter-agency crusade to reduce and standardize forms.

OBS. Mr. Evans of the state suggested that all forms are tools and as such have a purpose. He also agreed, however, that there are too many forms.

OBS. Mr. Smith stated that IJCB is actively trying to reduce the number and size of the forms. They are seeking unison of forms with the Board of Higher Education and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

OBS. The approval of programs in technical education and the certification of teachers in such subjects are so closely managed by the Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation that the autonomy of the several junior colleges is intruded upon.

ANS. Mr. Smith agreed that often the price of money and aid from the Board of Vocational Education was too high in terms of loss of institutional independence. The Illinois Junior College Board itself only passes on whether the college should be in any specific curricular business.

ANS. Mr. Evans said that the intentions of the Board of Vocational Educatio were good, and he is seeking methods of improving services.

* * *

ADMISSION POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN JUNIOR COLLEGES . . . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Charles J. Carlsen
Dean of Students, Black Hawk College

"The Purpose of a Course Numbering System" . . . . Herbert Zeitlin
President, Triton College

Progress Report on Master Plan Committee "B" . . . . Donald H. Winandy
Research Associate, Illinois Board of Higher Education

"Counseling and Testing Part-Time Students" . . . . T. E. Deem
Dean of Arts and Sciences, Lake Land College

Discussion

Recorder . . . . Thomas A. Juravich
Dean of Admissions, Illinois Central College

Mr. Charles J. Carlsen, Dean of Students, Black Hawk College, opened the meeting attended by approximately 100 people by introducing the various members of the panel.

The following are the addresses made by each respective panelist in orde of presentation.

Purpose of a Course Numbering System

Herbert Zeitlin

When Dr. Robert Darnes asked me to discuss the purpose of a course numbering system, I thought it was a simple topic and could be developed rather quickly. I checked the Encyclopedia of Educational Research and, to my surprise, found no mention of this subject. I then felt I had better look into it a little further and do some research.

A study of 29 of the present Illinois Public Junior College catalogs revealed some interesting facts.

Four years ago, before the passage of the Illinois Public Junior College Act, I did a similar study. At that time, few of the colleges explained their number system so, naturally, this time I expected to see quite a change.

I. Meaning of Course Numbers

To my surprise, 13 of the 29 catalogs now being published do not describe the significance of their course numbering system. Some changes, however, have taken place.

II. Trend Toward Developmental, Remedial, Preparatory or Self-Improvement Courses

At the last two national conventions of the AAJC much discussion took place on the responsibility of the junior colleges to provide programs for the disadvantaged. An examination of the Illinois Junior College Catalog revealed that 11 colleges of 29 have some kind of numbering description for courses in developmental, remedial, preparatory or self-improvement. Now, this is a step in the right direction, especially when compared to 4 years ago, when very few colleges had programs for the disadvantaged students.

III. Identification of Occupational Courses

Ten of the colleges had some number designation for their offerings in occupational or vocational technical programs. However, there was no prevailing pattern of classification.

For instance, one college put the letter "V" in front of those courses that were vocationally intended. Another college used numbers 10 through 99 to identify occupational courses. A third used the letter "T" to identify technical and "V" to indicate vocational before the course number. A fourth college said all courses below 100 were not intended for transfer, whereas a fifth college said all occupational and transfer courses above 100 were freshmen courses.

The sixth college used for identification, courses numbered 180 to 199 for freshman occupational courses and courses 280 to 299 for sophomore occupational courses. A seventh college used the prefix "C" before the number for continuing education and "T" for technical. An eighth college used the number "2" in their three-digit system to identify occupational programs. The ninth college used 100 to 150 for freshman occupational courses, and the last college used the number system 50 to 89 and 90 to 99 to identify the non-baccalaureate classes.

If anything, the identification of occupational courses shows that each college is using its own system.

IV. Freshman Transfer

There appeared to be a consistency, however, in the identification of freshman transfer courses. Thirteen of the colleges did have a statement which generally referred to all the freshman transfer courses as being at the 100 or above level, with one of the colleges stating that the freshman transfer was numbered 150 to 199.

V. Sophomore Transfer

Twelve of the 29 colleges had some statement that the sophomore transfer courses were labeled 200 or above or between 200-299. However, one college stated that the sophomore transfer was between 250 and 299.

VI. 300 Level Courses

As far as I could detect, none of the institutions had any 300 level courses. This is a good sign, since the seed for "growing up" to a senior institution has not as yet been planted.

VII. Other Observations

Only one college mentioned that its transfer courses were specifically designed for a particular university and full acceptance of transfer credits would be granted. Most of the colleges implied that if students made use of careful counseling and planning, most transfer courses would be acceptable. One of the larger institutions stated that the two-year terminal general education is similar to the two-year transfer. Many of us here would question that statement. One of the institutions used four numbers in front of its course titles with no explanation of what these numbers meant. A rather well-established college used numbers below 100 for all their courses, again with no explanation given.

On the basis of this little study, I suggest that we consider the following:

I. There is a Need for Coordination.

If we are to have a statewide system that communicates to the general public, all the junior colleges should try to adopt a numbering system that would communicate the same information. At the present time, uniformity is lacking with the exception, possibly, that the 100 level courses are generally considered freshman transfer courses.

II. There is a Need to Meet the Requirements of Area Technical-Vocational Centers.

At the present time, there are five or more area vocational centers, I would call to your attention the little booklet entitled, "Administration of Vocational Education, Rules and Regulations." Quoting from page sixteen:

1. "Funds under the 1963 Act will not be available for instruction which is designed to fit individuals for employment in recognized occupations which are generally considered to be professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree.

2. "Funds under the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts will not be available for instruction offered or designated by the institution offering it as providing credit leading to a baccalaureate or higher degree."

It is my belief that serious trouble will develop in the future if junior colleges try to circumvent the regulations of the Vocational Education Act. You can not receive vocational funds if the counselors or staff members try to have vocational-approved courses accepted for transfer credit. The vocational act is intended to prepare students for immediate employment. If students are programmed into vocational-technical courses with the thought that they will receive transfer credit later on it is a direct violation of the Act.

III. Catalogs Should Communicate.

If the catalog is to communicate to the students, then I believe every catalog should have at least a paragraph or more stating what the course numbering system means. Courses should be identified as:

(a) Occupational
(b) University transfer
(c) Developmental, remedial, preparatory or self-improvement.

If a course is identified as a transfer course, then the catalog should state what senior institution will accept it. I believe, as one of our state officials remarked recently, a course cannot be considered a transfer course unless some college or university is willing to accept it fully as a transfer course. Junior college faculties that develop courses that they consider transfer without a written articulation agreement with the senior institutions are doing a disservice to their students. Not too long ago, I heard a junior college specialist state:

> "Everybody knows that the junior college student, when he transfers to a senior institution, loses credit, and you can't do anything about it."

I cannot accept that statement. I believe that every junior college student, when he transfers to a senior institution, should have full acceptance of every course that his junior college calls a transfer or baccalaureate course. He should not lose a single credit!

IV. Need for Articulation Agreements.

The junior college is many things to many people, but it cannot be everything for everybody. Therefore, I suggest that junior colleges which desire full acceptance of their credits to the senior institutions develop articulation agreements with these senior institutions so that when their students are ready to transfer they are not shortchanged. If you are not doing this now, it can be done and should be done with alacrity.

V. State Guidelines Are Needed.

The 29 catalogs studied showed that each college has more or less developed its own course numbering system. Now that we have a state system of junior colleges, I believe the state office should develop guidelines in the numbering of courses, so that better communication to the public can take place. The junior colleges in Illinois, in recent years, were considered the last resort for students seeking higher education. If we are to move in the direction of general acceptance to desired preference, then we must assure our students that they will not lose a single credit upon transfer. To do nothing on the course numbering system, as we have done for many years here in Illinois, would mean a continuation of loss of credits by some students. I do hope that this group will go on record requesting the state junior college staff to develop guidelines for the numbering of our courses.

* * *

Progress Report on Master Plan Committee "B"

Donald H. Winandy

The Board of Higher Education has depended upon advisory committees in its planning activities, giving those persons affected by any decisions that might be made, an opportunity to participate in the decision making process.

You know Don Canar of Central Y.M.C.A. Community College, Bob Darnes of the Illinois Junior College Board, Everett Hamilton of the Board of Vocational Education, Jim Jeanguenat of Wilson Campus - Chicago City College, and Don Swank of Parkland College. These five men are among the 15 persons serving on Committee B, one such advisory group.

In 1963 Committee B studied and reported on Admission and Retention of Students. The Committee report was one of several documents used in the formulation of the first master plan for higher education in Illinois.

To take a new look at students and check the effects of some recommendations in the original master plan on students today, Committee B was reestablished in September, 1967, by the Board of Higher Education.

The first two new undertakings of the Committee in 1967-68 were statewide studies of student retention and attrition in Illinois colleges and of college freshman characteristics. A subsequent study has been designed to secure information on policies and practices affecting articulation of transfer students from one institution to another in 1968-69, and to replicate the original 1962 Study on Freshman Admissions Policies and Practices.

Student Characteristics Study

A study of student characteristics was proposed and designed to secure descriptive data on 1967 freshmen at Illinois institutions of higher education, as well as providing a basic data bank for future studies.

Over 12,000 freshmen who enrolled in Illinois colleges and universities for the fall term of 1967 were sent the Student Information Form to gather data on their backgrounds, self estimates, educational choices, and career plans.

Certain item responses from the Student Information Form will be matched with identical items from the American Council on Education (ACE) form for those students who participated in the 1967 ACE National Survey. American College Testing Program (ACT) scores are also to be incorporated into the data file for each student in the characteristic study who had taken the ACT battery.

These data are intended to add several dimensions to existing studies. First, they have extended the bank of student data to as broad a base as possible among Illinois colleges and universities. Secondly, they have added information which may be used to answer questions vital to program planning in Illinois higher education. Further, they are available for analysis and consideration as essential elements of information that may be incorporated into a higher education general information system.

Retention Study

A study on retention was designed to provide information on student persistence in educational programs entered and an indication of trends in the "holding power" of institutions. Further, it was hoped, the study would identify reasons why students discontinued their education, while at the same time securing an index of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction with their educational experience.

All colleges and universities in Illinois were invited to participate in the retention study. Each cooperating institution provided a retention and attrition summary for its 1960 and 1965 freshman classes. They also provided a roster of those fulltime freshman who had discontinued attendance without graduation. Fifty percent (17,500) of those students were sent the Student Information Questionnaire.

Thus far, one major finding has been that although many students may not stay at the institution in which they originally entered and/or may interrupt their attendance at the institution which they are attending, a rather high percentage of 1960 students (64% in this 7-year study) persisted in their studies until they achieved a degree. These findings are consistent with the Eklund Study done at the University of Illinois which found that about 70 percent of the subjects completed their bachelor's degree over a ten-year period.

The same kind of persistence also existed for the junior colleges. At the end of two years, 22 percent had graduated from the junior college in which they started, and at the end of seven years 31.4 percent had done so.

A major purpose of this study was to determine why students leave the institution which they first attend. A substantial number of the men from 1965 had enlisted in the military service. Students from 1965 at the same time expressed dissatisfaction with instructors and teaching methods as a reason for leaving college. The pattern of responses was otherwise virtually the same for both groups. Of the students who responded on the study, approximately one-third left their original institution because they were dismissed for academic failure. This percentage is practically identical with almost every attrition study that has been done within the last 40 years.

Fourteen percent of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the general environment in which they found themselves. Over ten percent of them indicated that one of their major reasons for leaving was they were restless and unsettled. The next most important reason given was financial difficulty.

It may well be that it is necessary for a fairly large percentage of students to try more than one institution until they can find the one which best meets their needs. It is possible that some of these students, regardless of where they begin and where they eventually receive their degree, find it necessary to make a change.

Study of Admission Policy and Practice

Since the characteristics and retention studies have completed their data gathering activities, the Task Forces No. 1 and No. 2 analyzed those data and are now writing their findings to be reviewed by Committee B and eventually incorporated into its report to the Board of Higher Education.

A Task Force No. 3 was charged with study evaluation and planning of new projects within the framework of the Committee B "charge." Their deliberations resulted in the design of a study of admissions policies and practices affecting transfer students in Illinois higher education, and a replication of the 1962 Committee B study on freshmen admission policies and practices. The Study of Admissions Policies and Practices will be initiated this winter.

But before the colleges are asked to cooperate in this further effort, they will get some of the results of the characteristics and retention studies. The individual institutional profiles from both studies will be sent to the liason person named by the president.

The complete report on characteristics and retention of Committee B is expected to be submitted to the Board of Higher Education in February. It should be available to the institutions soon thereafter.

* * *

Counseling and Testing Part-Time Students

T. E. Deem

I am not in student services as such at this time but Bob Darnes asked me to approach this topic from the viewpoint of course placement and problems in the classroom.

A couple of publications to which I referred for background reading are "College Personnel Services for the Adult" (A Report of Commission XIII, Student Personnel Work for Adults in Higher Education, American College Personnel Association and "Speaking About Adults - and the Continuing Educational Process" (a Report by R. Phillip Carter and Verl M. Sharp of the Proceedings from the Adult Basic Education Workshop, Northern Illinois University, 1966). I would recommend both as being pertinent to testing and counseling for the adult part-time student.

I will not be discussing specific kinds of tests or counseling approaches. The above two publications do cover these areas. I would also refer you to Al Martin, Junior College Board staff member, who has ditto copies available of a paper he read at the Illinois Testing Commission Meeting of April 30, 1968. His paper was entitled "Testing Needs in Illinois Junior Colleges: Adult Education."

Students can most certainly be properly placed and successful in a course without ever taking any placement tests or ever having a counseling session. We also know that both students and instructors could have problems in the classroom because of improper placement due to students not taking placement tests and/or not having a counseling session with a counselor or academic advisor. Of course there could be and is improper placement when there is testing and counseling but the chances of making better placement decisions is much higher with the testing and counseling combined.

By improper placement I mean a student who is registered for a course but the course content is too advanced or too easy for him. For the advanced situation, the student would then have a problem of having to spend too much time on a course or not even being able to succeed in the course. For the too-easy situation, the student would be wasting his time. The instructor might possibly slow down the pace of his course and not cover the subject as deeply as needed or he might do the opposite. In either case, the course would not be what it was planned to be and students who were properly placed would suffer.

Although practically all public junior colleges in Illinois indicate that they require the ACT, which I assume most use as an aid in placement, there is a large discrepancy in the number of Illinois public junior college students who take the ACT and the enrollment of freshmen in the Illinois public junior colleges. The ACT freshman class profile for the 1967-68 academic year for all public junior colleges in the State of Illinois showed only 14,277 students. This figure compares with 27,394 full-time freshmen students and 26,059 part-time freshmen students in Illinois public junior colleges as indicated on page 9 of the Anderson and Spencer "Report of Selected Data and Characteristics" for the 1967-68 academic year.

It appears from the above that all full-time students are not being required to take the ACT before placement and most part-time students apparently are not taking the ACT. Add to the total of the full-time and part-time students of 53,453 another 12,189 unclassified students and you can see that many students are not taking the placement test that most Illinois public junior colleges say they are using. Some institutions are using local tests, however, and this might overcome some of this discrepancy but certainly not all of it.

Although testing and counseling in relation to proper placement is a problem for both full-time and part-time students, I will mostly be concentrating on the part-time student for the rest of my presentation.

In order to have more background for this presentation I conducted a survey of the Illinois public junior colleges in regard to their testing and counseling practices. The results of this survey have been made available to you. I attempted to ask the questions in a logical order and hope I partially succeeded.

The questionnaire was mailed to 27 Illinois public junior colleges and there were 21 returns.

Twelve of the 21 institutions reported that there had been feedback from instructors that academic problems have resulted due to part-time students being improperly placed. As maybe seen by the question (number 20) it referred to part-time students who had not taken placement tests and/or who had not had counseling sessions. I am sure that other kinds of placement problems were involved in the answer to this question but it would still reflect the situation to which I was referring.

Nine institutions reported that course pace was indicated by instructors as being affected due to improper placement. The pace, of course, could have been either increased or decreased.

Ten of the institutions reported that feedback was received from part-time students, who had not had placement tests and/or counseling sessions before placement, that they had been improperly placed. Again, pace was indicated as being affected.

For purposes related to this topic I am considering testing as a "sample of behavior taken under standardized conditions from which is made an inference or prediction of future behavior in a greater population of related behaviors." (Report of Commission XIII, A.C.P.A.) In other words, tests for placement purposes are used for predicting subsequent performances or behavior.

Although I am using the term counseling here, I am only considering it in the narrow phase of academic advising. Also involved here could be career advising although it would end up in academic advising. A counselor is probably preferable in this kind of advising although an instructor in a field in which the student is interested could possibly be better qualified to advise a student in regard to a specific career and a specific course. For the overall program the counselor is probably preferable in advising. The counselor would be especially preferable because of the need to interpret standardized test results, analyze high school grades, predict student motivation and bring in any other factors needed to help the student make a wise decision.

If we look at the functions or purposes of public junior colleges, we see that upgrading or retraining of adults, preparation for transfer to a four-year college or university, preparation for an occupation or career, cultural development, and personal improvement or academic adventuring are all included. In view of this, we have a varied clientele as to age, goals, attendance, and so forth.

Another purpose that is normally included among the listed purposes of junior colleges is counseling. I assume that this means counseling for both full and part-time students. It is possible that a number of junior colleges are failing to meet this purpose for part-time students. If the North Central Association evaluates an institution on the basis that it is meeting its established purposes, I wonder how many of us would be in trouble at this time. I certainly am not trying to put anyone on the spot but 5 of the 21 Illinois public junior colleges indicated that part-time day students do not have a counseling session with a counselor before being placed in a class and 12 indicated the same answer for part-time evening students. Of course the students may be meeting with academic advisors which could partially overcome this situation.

Another way to look at this situation is as follows. Since we claim (or I would hope that we would claim) to be a service-oriented and student-oriented kind of institution, then we should try to do all that we can realistically do to help the student in making wise decisions and in being successful. Testing and counseling of part-time students as well as full-time students should therefore be part of our service.

As mentioned before, we do have a varied clientele as to attendance, age, goals and so forth. Since this is the case, testing and counseling problems are probably different for the different clientele. General categories of part-time students can be based on (1) attendance - day and night (or possibly both), and (2) college age students (under 21) and adult students (21 and above). Other categories could be established but let us just consider these for our purposes here. We have part-time adult students that attend during the day and we also have them attending in the evening. The same may be said for part-time college-age students.

For those students who attend the day session, testing and counseling should not really be a problem, especially in regard to counseling, since counselors are normally around during the day. For the evening students, however, testing and counseling is a problem. Testing is a problem because of arranging a time for taking the tests. The students are also usually 21 or over and have not taken or recently taken standardized tests. Arrangements for taking local tests for placement also creates some problems. Both problems can be overcome, however. Counseling for the evening student is a problem because counselors are not always available, even for academic advising before registration. I am thinking now of counseling being available in the evening and not during the day.

Testing for these adult students is not quite as important as counseling (or academic advising.) Many of these students might not be test oriented or might be "rusty" in the subjects tested and therefore might do poorly on the tests. These same students could, however, be successful in the classroom. They might also be successful in the classroom because of having more recognizable goals and therefore being highly motivated. In view of this, although testing, especially locally-constructed tests, would possibly help, it is not really imperative.

I believe that counseling is much more important than testing for the adult evening student. Although a number will know exactly what they want from the junior college, most could definitely make use of career, curriculum and course advising. Some might have a vague idea of what careers, curriculums and courses are available and what the prospects and/or benefits of such are, but many do not.

Triton College may have a different situation or different approach, however, because they did find, in comparing their full-time and part-time college age and adult students for the 1967-68 first semester, that part-time adult students, although admitted to baccalaureate-level courses without placement testing and with minimal counseling, had the highest grade point average, and that the adult student in general made higher grades than college-age students.

I imagine that most of the colleges would possibly find results similar to Triton's. Even with these results, however, there are probably a number of adult students who do not do well and who can definitely benefit from counseling. Triton found that there was a drop-out rate for adults, both full and part-time of approximately 25 percent.

It is also believed that most of the adult students would make use of counseling services if the availability of counselors and the kinds of services these counselors could give were publicized.

A possibly significant problem is proper placement for part-time college age students. Triton College found in their study that part-time college age students had the lowest grade point average and the highest percentage of drops (34 percent.) This possibly occurs at the rest of our institutions. If it does, it means that we should also probably be concentrating on our counseling and placement of these students.

As may be seen from the results of my survey, six institutions indicated that they had no placement problems with part-time students due to failure to have testing or counseling for these students. All but one of the six institutions do have all part-time students taking standardized and/or local tests, and do have counseling sessions (one indicates a limited session) with these students prior to placement in courses. This might be significant for the rest of us.

I think most of us agree to the theory that there is a right program for practically all of our students. It is up to counselors using test results, educational background, student non-educational experience, student motivation and other kinds of information to help the student find the right program. I would believe that this would be just as appropriate for part-time students as for full-time students.

* * *

After the members of the panel made their presentations, Mr. Carlsen opened the discussion with questions from the floor. The discussion is summarized as follows:

Courses that are considered Junior and Senior level courses are often offered by Junior Colleges in their Adult and Continuing Education Program. Dr. Zeitlin indicated that the Junior College had a responsibility of indicating in some manner that these particular courses were designated specifically for Adult Education purposes and that they were in no way part of the regular curriculum in the transfer program.

There seemed to be some differences among junior colleges in terms of their requirements for evening and part-time students. In general, most colleges have their part-time and evening students talk with a counselor concerning the course they are selecting for enrollment during a particular semester. Administrative requirements for admission for full time students were not applicable to part time students.

A study at Triton Junior College indicated that the adult student seemed to be more motivated and consequently his level of achievement was higher than regular full time students.

There was a general agreement among panelists that efforts be made to provide counseling and testing services for part-time students.

* * *

THE JUNIOR COLLEGES AND THE EXTENSION DIVISION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . .Frank D. Sorenson
Coordinator of Extension, Western Illinois University

"Public Colleges and Universities" . . . . .Stanley C. Robinson
Dean of Division of University Extension,
University of Illinois at Urbana

"Private Colleges and Universities" . . . . .Donald A. Johnson
Dean of Evening College, Bradley University

"Junior Colleges" . . . . .Robert E. Johnson
Dean of Adult Education, Thornton Junior College

Discussion

Recorder . . . . .Gordon R. Stone
Evening Division Director, Belleville Area College

Stanley C. Robinson

Summary

In representing the six state universities and two four-year state colleges, Dr. Stanley C. Robinson emphasized the two primary problems faced in adult and continuing education, namely supply and demand -- a growing demand for services which threatens to bog down universities and the shortages of supply we suffer in money, manpower, machinery, skill, imagination and facilities. To cope with this situation, he suggested three focuses of emphasis and action:

(1) definition of responsibility among the institutions and agencies engaged in adult education

(2) creative identification of areas and procedures for cooperation among these institutions and agencies

(3) establishment of priorities - identifying and allocating areas of responsibility among institutions will be difficult but highly advisable

Undoubtedly, post-professional adult education is in the sphere of the comprehensive universities. Further, many phases of continuing education, particularly post-professional, demand the expertise available only in a multi-disciplinary institution.

As the two-year junior and community colleges enter into programs of adult and continuing education, they face both the temptation to mimic successful programs offered by the senior institutions and the challenge to exploit their grass-roots strength in the pioneering of new programs, unique to their needs. The pioneering challenge and opportunity is three-fold: First, it involves the close study of individual communities, their needs and problems;

second, it involves determining ways the institution can meet community needs with its available resources; and third, it demands recognition of responsibility to implement the programs.

Dr. Robinson emphasized the importance of research to determine need for adult extension services rather than solely the pressure of special interest groups. Further, if services are to be provided economically, it will require inter-institutional cooperation, perhaps on a regional basis. Though the junior colleges must look to the four-year institutions for assistance in finding solutions to problems in which their own resources are lacking, conversely, the four-year colleges and universities must turn over to the two-year colleges programs which are most appropriate to their operation, capability and expertise.

There is great possibility for the institutions to work together in solving problems as exemplified in the joint multi-media instruction project of the University of Illinois Division of University Extension with Highland, Springfield and Kishwaukee Colleges.

Complement, supplement and create are three key words as we cope with the problem of supply and demand. The fourth term, "priorities," implies that individually and jointly, as institutions, we must determine through cooperation and consultation what is critical and must be done now and what is of lesser urgency as well as the apparent comparative degrees of significance and urgency.

* * *

Donald A. Johnson

Summary

Dr. Johnson indicated that he was in no way authorized to speak for private colleges and universities but felt that Bradley's problems are representative of other private schools. He indicated that Bradley University's concept of boundaries for extension services has increased from regional to state and to the national levels. Bradley operates for both public as well as private interests and serves as a reservoir of intellectual leadership in community affairs. Its resources must be extended to individuals and groups not normally within the sphere of institutional influence. The educational institution exists for the purpose of converting knowledge into usable form for its clientele, hence, the justification for adult education and extension services. However, institutional integrity, in the offering of carefully selected courses, must be maintained.

Dr. Johnson felt that any city of 40,000 or more population should have the means of offering a comprehensive "package" of adult education and thereby eliminating the problems of the piecemeal and overlapping offerings of many institutions and organizations. Such a planned approach could be handled through an adult education coordinating council.

In our extension services, we realize that we are dealing with an older, more mature student whose orientation is increasingly toward the improvement of a particular competency. This fact has implications for designing courses away from those traditionally offered in the liberal arts and sciences.

Above all, we need to stop, in order that we obtain a proper perspective of what is needed in the community. Then, and only then, can we plan and implement a more effective program.

* * *

Robert E. Johnson

Summary

A comprehensive junior college must, by virtue of definition, include in its offering continuing education and community services. At Thornton Junior College, extension services are offered through seven local adult education centers and through "mini-centers," such as a Head Start center, a county hospital for indigents and through the assistance of some churches.

Our needs are, indeed, great. We need extension offerings at junior high schools and elementary schools as well. We need innovative means to take the educational situation out of the traditional classroom setting and into the community. We need manpower and research assistance from the four-year institutions to assist the two-year institutions in the identification of community needs.

Thornton cooperates with other agencies and institutions making available its facilities for needed courses by extension. Dr. Johnson indicated that in coordinating course offerings with other institutions, many details could be handled cooperatively to make the coordination of extension efforts more effective, e.g. the standardization of registration processes by the various institutions.

Junior colleges need to offer courses which will avoid duplication and competition with senior institutions, hence the need for cooperation. There is the need for area-wide extension planning by junior college districts and senior institutions to determine where the best facilities are available to meet certain needs and, through research and surveys, to determine where these needs reside.

Needed also is the more systematic development of course sequences which will lend continuity to programs the student plans to take by extension.

Particularly in the area of human relations, the junior colleges must offer workshops, conferences and seminars, relying heavily upon the use of the expertise of personnel from the universities combined with the physical resources of the junior colleges.

Junior colleges need to be centers of cultural enrichment and it is in this vein that the senior institutions can cooperatively use their facilities to offer art displays, music performances, etc.

We further need to develop technical conferences for business and industry. Little cooperation has existed between the institutions in this area.

While continuously assessing changing needs in a changing community, our task is to use the junior college as a vehicle to provide education to all levels of the community from the formal classroom to the ghetto.

* * *

WILL THERE BE A PLACE FOR THE JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER STUDENT? Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . G. Robert Darnes
Associate Secretary, Illinois Junior College Board

University of Illinois . . . . Lyle H. Lanier
Executive Vice President; Provost, University of Illinois

Southern Illinois University . . . . Robert W. MacVicar
Chancellor, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities . . .Joseph V. Totaro
Associate Executive Officer

Board of Regents . . . . Franklin G. Matsler
Executive Secretary

Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities
T. W. VanArsdale
President, Bradley University; President, Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities

Discussion

Recorder . . . . .F. Robert Mealey
Dean of the College, McHenry County College

Introduction

G. Robert Darnes

There has been a spectacular growth in junior college enrollments. Many people are wondering where the junior college transfer student will go. It is with that thought in mind that this seminar session was planned for this conference. I would almost be apologetic to our panel members in that we have such a distinguished group with no more time than has been allotted. However, the format of this conference was such that it couldn't be helped. Every member on our panel is a distinguished educator and has numerous credits and honors. In order to keep introductions to a minimum and to provide as much time as possible for their presentations and discussion from the floor, I will introduce each of them briefly and ask that their presentations follow in that order. There is no specific reason for the order in which their names appear on the program but we will follow this arrangement.

First, let me introduce our guests on the program. Dr. Lyle H. Lanier, Executive Vice President and Provost of the University of Illinois, will discuss with us plans that the University of Illinois has for the junior college transfer student. Dr. Lanier.

Dr. Robert W. MacVicar, Chancellor of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, will discuss the future plans of Southern Illinois University for the junior college transfer student. Dr. MacVicar.

Dr. Joseph V. Totaro, Associate Executive Officer of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, will discuss the plans of the institutions under that governing board. Dr. Totaro.

Dr. Franklin G. Matsler, Executive Secretary to the Board of Regents and new to the State of Illinois, will discuss the plans that the institutions under that Board have for the junior college transfer student. Dr. Matsler.

At this conference we have included public and private universities because they, too, are part of the higher education system in Illinois. Representing the Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities is Dr. T. W. VanArsdale, President of the Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities and President of Bradley University. He will discuss the plans of the independent colleges and universities for junior college transfer students. Dr. VanArsdale.

Serving as our recorder today is F. Robert Mealey, Dean of the College at McHenry County College. Mr. Mealey.

Without further introduction, will you gentlemen please proceed with your reports in the order listed on the program.

* * *

Lyle H. Lanier

Summary

Dr. Lanier noted that the plans of the University of Illinois for future concerns of the junior college transfer student would be an extension of the past activities of that institution. He noted that the University of Illinois had accepted, in principle, the Master Plan for Higher Education developed in 1964. He stated that as a result of this acceptance, enrollment projections during the last four years at the Urbana Campus and the Circle Campus had taken into consideration the place needed for the junior college transfer student. He noted that at the Urbana Campus of the University, over-projections of enrollments occurred at the upper division level until 1968-69 when enrollments were under-projected at both the upper and lower division level. He advised of an under-projection during the last four year period at the Circle Campus. That institution has found that during that period of time their enrollments in lower divisions were up 1,000 and enrollments in other divisions were up 4,000. He stated that plans for 1980 reflected 25,000 student enrollments at the undergraduate level at both the Urbana Campus and at the Circle Campus. He indicated that a projected 2-3 ratio would provide 10,000 lower division students and 15,000 upper division students and noted that the latter category would provide room for the junior college transfer student.

* * *

Robert W. MacVicar

Summary

Dr. MacVicar stated that the plans for the junior college transfer student currently made by Southern Illinois University would provide a first call on the resources of the University for the junior college transfer. He indicated that this was congruent with the acceptance of the principle of the Master Plan by Southern Illinois University. He reported that an example of developing these resources was the design for housing facilities suitable for the more mature student and the intended restriction of traditional underclassman dormitory construction. He noted that the experience of SIU was that the junior college transfer student tended to be older than the native student of equivalent class level and tended to be married. Therefore, he cited the need for a different type of housing facilities. Dr. MacVicar cautioned personnel of the junior colleges to encourage junior college transfer students to submit application for admission to the University early in order to facilitate adequate planning for these students.

* * *

Joseph V. Totaro

Summary

Dr. Totaro noted that his comments should be viewed from the perspective of the four institutions under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities, that is, Chicago State College, Eastern Illinois University, Northeastern Illinois State College and Western Illinois University. He noted that although each institution may vary slightly in details, each is developing procedures which will help simplify the transition from junior to senior colleges or universities.

Dr. Totaro noted that the junior college transfer student may present to the transfer institution less than one year of junior college course work, or less than two years of junior college work without an associate degree, or two years of junior college work including an associate degree and be, in all these situations, in good academic standing. Or the transfer student may present less than two years of junior college work and not be in good academic standing. He noted additionally that the junior college transfer student may present a background in an occupational program after having decided to pursue a program leading to a baccalaureate degree. He stated that the type of place to be available to the junior college transfer student would vary according to the type of background which the student presented to the transfer institution. He quoted a proposal by President Sachs of Northeastern Illinois State College that the public senior colleges in Illinois will accept the first two years of transfer credit at a block entitling the junior college student to junior standing and certifying that he has met the general education requirements satisfactorily. He indicated that such a policy would extensively affect the place for the junior college transfer student.

Dr. Totaro suggested that junior colleges increase information and guidance with respect to transfer requirements, and work closely with senior institution personnel to produce meaningful information for such students. He suggested that the junior and senior college personnel recognize that the new venture may not profit fully from previous experience and that an open-minded and frank relationship involving mutual trust must be developed. He cautioned that an over-concern for the transfer program must not detract from the occupational programs of junior colleges. He added that, in general, it would be wise for senior and junior college personnel to encourage the transfer student to refrain from such transfer until they have completed the program in the junior college.

He noted the past efforts of the institutions under the Board of Governors in mobilizing resources and collaborating with junior colleges and he stated his belief that these efforts would be continued.

* * *

Franklin G. Matsler

Summary

Dr. Matsler noted that an example of where the junior college transfer student might go was the newly created Sangamon State University in Springfield, which would enroll nothing but transfer students and graduate students.

He noted that the movements in the State of California to increase the number of transfer students and toward a stiuation of no underclassmen at the senior institutions may prove to be an experience worth study by the personnel of Illinois. He noted that the trends in transfer procedures were to an acceptance of general education requirements as provided by the junior colleges and that transfer students will be less able to find room of transferring as freshmen or sophomores. He noted that studies revealed that the transfer student may take longer to graduate with a baccalaureate degree and that this should be considered when preparing a place for a junior college transfer student.

Dr. Matsler reviewed the articulation conference procedures and appointment of specialized personnel as examples of the past efforts on the past of Northern Illinois University and Illinois State University to provide a place for the junior college transfer student. It is his belief that these activities will be continued and extended.

* * *

T. W. VanArsdale

Summary

The endorsement of the junior college movement and the basic principles of the Master Plan by the independent colleges in the State of Illinois was the first consideration by Dr. VanArsdale. He stated that the independent colleges are taking steps to prepare space as they assume their share of the responsibility for providing for the junior college transfer student.

He reported that the Illinois Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers have asked the Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities to prepare a position statement on the junior college transfer student.

He noted that many of the independent colleges are experiencing a trend toward upper classman enrollments and that plans for providing adequate facilities are being developed in view of these projections.

Dr. Darnes chaired the questions during which members of the approximately 80 person audience addressed a variety of questions to the panel of participants.

* * *

UNIT COST STUDY . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Wayne J. Stumph
Dean of Business Services, Belleville Area College

Panel

Keith W. Smith
Associate Director,
Illinois Board of
Higher Education

Louis D. Audi
Assistant to the Vice Chancellor
for Business Affairs,
Chicago City College

Richard Schimmel
Director of Institutional Services, Elgin Community College

Recorder . . . . James L. Williams
Business Manager, Illinois Valley Community College

Keith W. Smith

Summary

Unit Cost Study efforts on a system wide scale were first attempted starting in 1951 with the Big Ten California Study. Not all institutions have participated. This study identified the product as a graduated student.

The first Illinois universities cost observation was taken in 1964-65. There are some deficiencies. The basic fundamental core has not changed, but some arbitrary decisions inherent in such studies are being reviewed.

Unit cost analysis should provide a better basis and guideline for funding.

The current Junior College Cost Study Manual has developed a few problems due to:

1. Inadequate scaling down from senior institutions.
2. Insufficient guidance and instruction from board staffs.
3. Lack of uniform accounting.

Believes we show promise for a first effort. 1965 funding level not inadequate. Present data still inadequate to present to legislature.

* * *

Richard Schimmel

Summary

Student credit hours = student x hours, therefore:

As instructor's salaries rise--costs rise.
As class size increases costs go down.
Top salaries and small classes = high cost.
Low salaries and large classes = low cost.

Faculty effort is tied to class size (not alone /ws).

* * *

Louis D. Audi

Summary

This allocation on the dollar base was wrong. If he were doing it, he would use credit hours.

Efforts are still too new to provide real scientific quality.

Progress to date indicates that we are on the way to sound data in many areas.

This data can set a price tag on an area of effort, perhaps a school or department, perhaps a method of instruction. It cannot assign a quality to the product to compare with the cost but must permit other areas of college administration to answer such questions.

* * *

STUDENT ACTIVITIES IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Tom Freeman
Vice Chairman of IACJC Student Division, Kaskaskia College

"Intramurals" . . . . Joseph F. Palmieri
Head of Physical Education, College of DuPage

"College Newspaper" . . . . James M. Berberet
Publications Advisor, Highland Community College

"Cultural Series". . . . . Frank Borelli
Director of Student Activities, William Rainey Harper College

Recorder . . . . Sue Wally
Secretary of IACJC Student Division, Kendall College

Intramurals

Joseph F. Palmieri

The most repeated question to any termpaper assignment I've ever given has to be, "How long, professor?" And I always say, "As long as a girl's skirt - long enough to cover the subject, but short enough to be interesting." When I was first informed that this talk would be limited to ten minutes, I decided that no one could give even a mini-view of intramurals in that period of time. So I will attempt a bikini-view instead, which I hope will be successful in capturing your attention and opening your eyes.

Fields, in his book The Community College Movement, states that "each college is a reflection of the community served, the purposes sought, the functions undertaken, and the resources at hand." To fulfill its purposes and functions the community college program must be adaptable and flexible, thereby enabling it to meet the needs of the community it serves. The adaptability-flexibility formula rules out instant or exact prescriptions for successful intramural programs, for no two can or should be exactly alike.

Programs, organizational structures, facilities, finances, personnel, conditions, and even philosophies are different in each school. So I can only give you what I personally feel are some of the important guidelines in planning and/or evaluating present intramural programs in the community colleges here in Illinois.

First and foremost is the need for a written school policy that recognizes the need for and strongly supports a voluntary, comprehensive intramural program for all students - men, women, old, young. This is part of total education. This school policy should be supported by the department's stated objectives and desired outcomes in terms of educational goals. This one point could make an excellent theme for a philosophical and educational paper. Suffice it to say here that one of the greatest dearths in American education today is in the area of laboratory and worthwhile laboratory experiences that contribute toward lasting, positive citizen and human relationships. I personally believe that gymnasiums, fields, swimming pools, and other athletic facilities are democratic bargains when compared to the costs this country and government could be called upon to bear without them. Once the institution has accepted this educational commitment, three closely related areas follow for consideration:

1. Establishment of an organizational plan that will accomplish this purpose in the most expedient manner possible. In my opinion, this means the selection of one individual to oversee the physical education instruction, the intramural, and the athletic programs of the institution. His primary responsibility should be to coordinate and maintain balance of programs of the institution. His primary responsibility should be to coordinate and maintain balance of programs in terms of achieving institutional and program objectives. The rationale for such an arrangement will be obvious as I explain the details.

As early as possible, a coordinator or supervisor of intramurals, with training and personality for the job, should be appointed. His status and his pay should be equal to that of your football or basketball coach. Programs are built on men; so if it's good programs you want, leadership is the key. Under no circumstances should you rotate this responsibility. It didn't work for the Chicago Cubs before Leo Durocher came and it won't work for intramurals. To have continuity, a program must have constant, competent, dedicated leadership.

In deference to student activities, hosts for this seminar, I would like to raise a philosophical question often posed by new junior college administrators: "What is the relationship between intramurals and student activities:" Depending on structural organization, I see possible relationships in the areas of finance, calendar, student representation, and in what I call the non-instructional areas of student clubs and special activities. What I am trying to say here is that student activities begin, in essence, where intramurals end. For example, I can visualize a physical education ice skating class expanding to intramural ice hockey, and the intramural hockey developing into a hockey club. Sometimes this pattern is reversed: The intramural activity calls for physical education courses to support it. Last year the intramural program at DuPage included snow skiing, which was so well received that a club developed immediately. However, we discovered a basic need for instruction. This winter skiing will be offered as a physical education course as well as an intramural activity; and together they will support the ski club. Other areas in physical education and intramurals that could eventually branch into the student activities area include riflery, horsemanship, bowling, aquatics, etc.

Basic instruction in the physical education program remains the foundation, however, for intramurals and their possible lap-over into student activities. When special interest groups are formed to enlarge their interest in one particular area of physical education, student activities and intramurals come on the scene for a complete, ultimate relationship. Up to that point, I see intramurals largely under the wing of physical education.

In terms of money and student representation, it would appear that a better arrangement than dependence on student activities and student government representation for funds would be monies allocated from the general education budget and representation from the students actively involved in intramurals.

2. Make your instructional physical education program the heart of your intramural program. It is in physical education that quality instruction should be offered in a variety of course offerings to satisfy the needs, interests and abilities of many types of students. Here is where the skills, knowledges, and proper conditioning should initially be achieved. When they are not, you discover some of the common causes of failure in intramurals. The physical education department is - or should be - in the logical position to assume this leadership of articulation with students in the physical education class. It should also be directly involved with curriculum changes necessary to support the intramural program.

3. Once the philosophical, structural, and instructional bases are set, the availability and accessibility of finances and facilities should not be too much of a task. Funds equal to the task should be available. However, it is at this point that administrators and schools have, in the past, limited programs and, in some cases, eliminated intramurals. Here again, the organizational structure suggested with one person in charge of physical education, intramurals, and athletics, should make for a more efficient use of facilities, equipment, personnel, and money. Obviously something is wrong when a football team is allowed $200 for one meal on a football trip and the total intramural budget for the school year is less than that amount. This is not an uncommon practice. In my estimation your initial intramural budget should be equal to that of intercollegiate basketball or baseball and approximate the football budget when the program is in full operation.

Facilities may or may not involve finances, depending on the accessibility of these facilities. When I speak of facilities and programs, both for physical education classes and the intramural program, I think of facilities within the outside of the school. I have to introduce a cliche right here: "Think Community." Don't think high school or college, but think community in its broadest sense and scope. From the start, look for and utilize community resources. For example, at College of DuPage we are utilizing private pools, ice skating arenas, roller skating rinks, bowling alleys, riding stables, ski slopes, handball courts, a municipal rifle range, county lakes, public and private golf courses, grade schools, high schools, other colleges, a seminary, the local YMCA, city parks, private clubs, etc.

In your facilities planning for the future, look beyond the present school and community facilities. Just because your district does not have these facilities is no reason to exclude them from your over-all instructional program and therefore your intramural program. If none are available, improvise. Be creative, imaginative. Here is where men of vision are really needed. It is the job of leadership to complement and supplement school and community facilities, as the case may warrant, for optimum programming. May I strongly suggest that you incorporate an intramural building into your complete college plans. I shall elaborate on this point shortly.

Once the program is initiated, aim for 100% participation. Try to provide adequate opportunities for continued participation in many activities at ability levels commensurate with maintaining participation interest. Try to minimize elimination-type tournaments and one-time activities. The inclusion of individual and dual sports, coeducational indoor and outdoor activities emphasizing preparation for worthwhile use of leisure time, and team sports appear obvious in any well-balanced program.

For years intramurals in the junior colleges were carried on with inadequate staff, finances, facilities, and time allotted. If your school's philosophy in this area is similar to the one described earlier in this paper, the past practices of running intramurals after school from 3-5 or 4-6 or after the varsity gets through with facilities is obsolete, archaic, and impossible in meeting the tremendous needs ahead in the community colleges. We should aim to make programs available when students are available. Since our students will be available at all times of the day, it becomes obvious that an intramural building with programs available throughout the day and evening becomes necessary if you make your motto similar to ours at DuPage: "A sport for every student, and every student in a sport." Just the logistics of meeting the facility needs of, say, five to eight thousand students gives you an idea of the magnitude of this undertaking. So - dream .. dream .. dream ... Make them big, but make them sensible.

There should also be an integrated, cooperative, and involved relationship between intramurals, the physical education department, the student activities office, the school newspaper, and the students themselves.

If instruction is the heart of intramurals, then publicity and student relations are its soul. School newspapers should make sufficient space available for intramural publicity and reporting equal to that given intercollegiate athletics. This could include the use of the school newspaper for entry blanks, the publishing of schedules, results, and standings with a generous number of photos and names throughout the year. The minimum allocated space, even when money is a problem, should be one-fourth of the sports page. Bulletin boards or reserved spaces on same are excellent publicity media, as are newsletters, appropriate awards, and special recognition assemblies, to name a few.

Sufficient to say that students should be involved to a maximum degree throughout all school efforts in intramurals from the philosophical through the evaluation phases of this program.

There are two other factors that I would like to throw in parenthetically for your exploration and possible consideration: Firstly, community requests for inclusion in this and other programs for individuals not attending college. In the years ahead I can visualize the community colleges offering leadership and facilities for "intramural programs" open to non-students. The second deals with the exploration of granting physical education credit for extensive intramural participation after completion of a minimum requirement or proficiency in certain physical education areas. Time naturally does not permit further exposition of this idea.

All the factors we have named today will determine the intramural program best for you. You know your local problems, needs, interests, facilities, personnel, and the quality of your physical education programs far better than anyone else. You know your student body, your community, your administration, and your school. You must weigh and balance until you find the formula, the right answer.

I once worked for an autocratic college president who tried oh-so-hard to become democratic in his dialogue with me and stating his demands and then adding, "This is only a suggestion ... but don't forget where it came from."

I have also become acquainted with another type of administrator who retorts to suggestions with, "Tell me the time; don't tell me how to make the watch."

It was not my intention today to tell you what to do, like the college president. Nor was it my desire to tell you the time, let alone how to build the watch. However, I believe that I have assembled the parts so someone can build the watch -- so the students and the community can tell the time -- the intramural time -- that your community college is or will be making.

* * *

Cultural Arts Committee

Frank Borelli

Purpose:

The purpose of the Cultural Arts Committee is to provide the college and the community with programs of excellence that are representative of the various fine arts fields (e.g., art, dance, drama films and music). Through these programs individuals will be introduced to and lead to a further awareness of the fine arts. As a consequence there might be a subsequent appreciation of and interest in further involvement in areas of the fine arts.

Implementation:

To fulfill the purposes of the committee it is recommended that a general student-faculty committee be formed. The membership would include faculty members actively engaged in the fine arts fields and those in other disciplines who have an interest in the fine arts. Student members should exhibit interest in the various activities and a willingness to assume the responsibilities necessary in carrying out the functions of the committee.

Major Responsibilities of the General Committee:

The Cultural Arts General Committee will be the policy-making body for all cultural arts activities.

1. Prepare budgets as required for the program.

2. Determine the nature of the cultural arts events.

3. Work with appropriate offices for scheduling events.

4. Establish and coordinate the work of all cultural arts subcommittees as required.

5. Provide for and coordinate the work of an Annual Festival of Arts.

In addition to the general committee, the following sub-committees are recommended to provide for specific cultural arts functions as required.

Membership and terms of office are to be established by the General Committee:

1. Concert Committee
2. Lecture or Speakers Committee
3. Art Exhibits Committee
4. Drama Committee
5. Film Committee
6. Festival of Arts Committee

Membership of the General Cultural Arts Committee:

The membership of this committee should be twelve voting members - six faculty and six students. The committee should elect its own chairman from within, preferably a faculty member.

1. Faculty

    a. One faculty representative from each of the following areas appointed for two-year rotating terms.

        1. Art
        2. Drama
        3. Music

    b. Two faculty members at-large (from disciplines other than the above) appointed for one year terms. These faculty members may succeed themselves.

    c. Director of Student Activities (ex-officio)

2. Students

    a. One student representative from each of the following activities appointed, upon application, by the President of the Student Senate.

        1. Art
        2. Dramatics
        3. Music

    b. Three students at-large appointed, upon application, by the Student Senate for one year terms.

    These student representatives may succeed themselves.

Although the membership of the committee is drawn mainly from the fine arts area, all divisions would be encouraged to submit suggestions to the committee, particularly regarding the lectures. Ideally, the two faculty members at-large would provide the necessary balance between those involved in the fine arts and the other disciplines.

* * *

James M. Berberet

Summary

Community college editors and staffs should follow the rules established by practicing professional journalists: fairness, accuracy and thoroughness;

Community college newspapers should be the primary medium for expression of student opinion, commentary and criticism. They should seek to give "equal space" to all areas of the college--students, faculty and administration--in presenting controversial material.

Most importantly, community college newspapers should be a cross-section of their school. Full-time and part-time students should have a voice; teenage and adult students should have a voice; day-time and night-time students should have a voice. All segments of the total campus should be featured in the newspaper; all segments of the total campus should be allowed to express their views.

Finally, because the community college serves a particular town and/or a large district, the community college newspaper should be circulated throughout the entire district, either on a subscription basis or by a free mailing to selected residents of the district. Thus, the community college newspaper should seek not only to inform the students, faculty and administration of the college but also the residents of the entire college district.

* * *

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ON THE JUNIOR COLLEGE CAMPUS . . . . Seminar Session

Chairman . . . . Ronald Blumenburg
Student, Wilson Campus-Chicago City College

"Student Exchange Program" . . . . Barry L. Johnson
Chairman of Student Division
Sauk Valley College

"Student Government -- Parliamentary Procedure . . . Richard D. DeCosmo
Dean of Student Personnel Services
Moraine Valley Community College

"Recognition of Student's I.D. Cards" . . . . Stanley R. Groh
Dean of Student Services
Waubonsee Community College

Recorder . . . . Robert Fecke

Recognition of Students' ID Cards

Stanley R. Groh

Some students burn draft cards, others ignore ID cards, both actions reveal a process of recognition.

The first order of business in higher education is learning. At the risk of repetition, learning takes place in and outside the classroom of formal instruction. A student's educational goals, or college goals, can be reinforced or obstructed by extracurriculum activities (or student activities). By reviewing the community college catalogues for statements concerning student activities and the "Proceedings of the Second Statewide Junior College Conference" conducted by IACJC in 1967, educators observe an increasing awareness among students and faculty of the concept that student activities are inextricably intertwined with the total academic and college program. I would like to approach the recognition of ID three ways -

1. Student recognition
2. Local community recognition
3. Other colleges' recognition

Milton Pruitt notes in the publication by the American Personnel and Guidance Association the article entitled "College Student Personnel Work in the Years Ahead"

"There is a movement from the student group activities, and all college extravaganzas to the smaller occasion or function where personal identity is possible."

The quotation raises the question concerning the recognition of ID cards by students as a symbol of identity with an institution. An institution might provide experiences that may result in an attitude of indifference concerning identification. Or the experience in an institution and the community may be significant to the value system of the student learner and the ID may represent a symbol and reflect progress in the student's perception.

As you can note, the topic under consideration, "Recognition of Student ID Cards", appears to be based on a student's productive experience and resulting attitudes toward himself and the college.

A student's acceptance of his collegiate experience as productive may reflect in his interaction with the larger community outside the classroom. The reflection could stimulate favorable interaction. And where the community looks upon the students favorably the ID card could provide the basis for special community privileges for the student body -- special privileges such as financial discounts in certain store, theaters, restaurants, etc. The financial recognition of the ID card may mean in a larger sense a two way acceptance of student body to community, and community to student body.

Another way to view recognition of student ID cards is among other institutions of higher learning. This approach also is based on the premise that institutions are conducting extracurricular activities that are meaningful and acceptable to students and their educational interests.

The obvious thoughts are recognition of ID cards for admission to cultural, athletic and other events.

A telephone survey of a few community colleges in the Northeast area of the state indicated a general lack of concern for this inter-school activity. I would propose for this last point the establishment of regional meetings of student activity directors to further explore the concept of promotion regognition of ID cards between schools for various student activities.

I would also propose an assessment of current student activities, extramural, and club activities to determine if each student can attach personel meaning to his "ID".

In summary: A student's recognition of his "total" college experience may help to give substance to his ID.

* * *

Ronald Blumenburg

Summary

The first speaker was Barry Johnson who spoke to the group regarding the student exchange program. Mr. Johnson asked for opinions of the program from the group.

The importance of the improved communication between the student governments of different campuses was mentioned, but the emphasis of the discussion was the problems of financing and the scheduling of similar classes on the campus by the exchange students.

Richard D. DeCosmo, in his address "Student Government-Parliamentary Procedure" emphasized the need for the student government organization to be truly representative of the student body. He mentioned that the student government must include informal as well as formal group representation. By informal groups Mr. DeCosmo was referring to clubs, organizations, and even small social groups. It was his contention that student government must include all these groups to be effective.

Richard DeCosmo also spoke on the subject of the need for a simple procedure by which student government meetings could be run.

* * *

BANQUET AND SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Presiding . . . . Robert E. Sechler
President, Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges

Entertainment . . . . Highland Community College
The Royal Scotts   Roger Roszell, Director

Speakers

Gerald W. Smith, Executive Secretary Illinois Junior College Board	Robert C. Bartlett Assistant Secretary, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

"State Coordinating Boards as Related to Recognition and Accreditation"

Gerald W. Smith

Recognition Functions and Practices

Introduction

Functions of the Illinois Junior College Board are described by such words as Studying -- Planning -- Coordinating -- Service -- Evaluation -- Determination of Standards -- Recommending.

Our discussion this evening focuses on Coordination and Recognition. Responsibility for evaluation of public junior colleges and administration of a recognition program on the part of the Illinois Junior College Board is statutory.

Several sections of the Public Junior College Act speak to the recognition function of the State Board. The most explicit and direct statements are:

> Section 102-12. "The State Board shall have the power and it shall be its duty:
>
> (e) "To determine efficient and adequate standards for junior colleges for the physical plant, heating, lighting, ventilation, sanitation, safety, equipment and supplies, instruction and teaching curriculum, library, operation, maintenance, administration and supervision, and to grant recognition certificates to junior colleges meeting such standards.
>
> Section 102-15. "The State Board shall grant recognition to junior colleges which maintain equipment, courses of study, standards of scholarship and other requirements set by the State Board. Application for recognition shall be made to the State Board. The State Board shall set the criteria by which the junior colleges shall be judged and through the executive officer of the State Board shall arrange for an official evaluation of the junior college and shall grant recognition of such junior colleges as may meet the required standards."

In the three years since the passage of the Public Junior College Act no function of the State Board has been the subject of more discussion than recognition.

The staff has spent many days of discussion on the performance of this function.

Dialogue with representatives of the colleges, especially the presidents and other administrative staff, have consumed many hours in our conferences and meetings.

Procedures

Two editions of Criteria and Standards for Evaluation and Recognition have been written, reviewed and adopted by the State Board for publication.

An application form for recognition as stipulated in the statute has been developed and each college is required to complete its application on the prescribed document each fall by November.

An associate secretary is assigned primary responsibility for the performance of the mandatory evaluation and recognition function charged to the executive officer of the board.

At the present time the 'arrangement' for 'official evaluation' includes:

a. Annual submission of an application for recognition.

b. Review of the application and tabulation of certain statistical data included in the form.

c. Communication with the college by mail, phone or personal conferences on matters not clearly understood or considered pertinent to 'recognition.'

d. Continuous exchange of information, and questions about the colleges between all of the staff members - especially at staff meetings which are regularly convened on the first and third Monday mornings of each month. Subject matter for these discussions are generated by correspondence and phone calls from the colleges, visits to our offices by representatives of the colleges, observations of staff members when visiting the colleges, news releases, and yes - even rumor and scuttlebutt.

e. Visits to the colleges under a variety of circumstances --
   1. Official visits for evaluation and recognition - perodic.
   2. Participation in activities at the college.
   3. Informal visits primarily for the purpose of better knowing the college by seeing - listening - asking questions.
   4. Numerous other occasions.

f. In May of each year, days are set aside solely for staff review and preparation of a recognition report with recommendations. These reports are mailed to the respective colleges and submitted to the State Board.

g. In June or July the staff reports and recommendations are officially reviewed and acted on by the State Board.

h. Certificates of recognition are issued effective for the ensuing year.

So much for the arrangement and procedures on the recognition process.

Criteria

What are the criteria? These are set forth in a publication entitled, Standards and Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of Illinois Public Junior Colleges and Other Guidelines, Policies and Procedures approved by the Illinois Junior College Board. Time does not permit and this is neither an appropriate occasion or suitable setting for detailing all of the criteria and standards. Let us therefore highlight a few categories.

1. Compliance with the law. This is a basic criterion for recognition.
    a. The Act requires colleges to be comprehensive and defines minimum acceptable criteria of comprehensiveness
    b. Admission requirements
    c. Tuition
    d. Governance and administration

2. Program - Performance of mission

3. Quality - as evidenced by
    Staff
        Student performance
            Spirit and Morale
                Facilities

Observations and Comments

My frequent conferences with the presidents, boards and other representatives appears to me to reveal -

Considerable resentment of the recognition function of the State Board.

Numerous concerns and fears that recognition will be used to restrict - inhibit and interfere with local initiative and deprive the college of a desirable degree of autonomy.

Grave doubt that the State Board staff will function or rise above a limited bureaucratic stilted level of thinking and performance.

Concern that the recognition power and function will be used to standardize and regiment the college programs and in fact create a system of teacher certification.

Concern that State Board staff members will perform as know-it-alls on a wide range of matters and tend to force their individual ideas and prejudices on the colleges.

Such concerns - fears and doubts are understandable and certainly not without at least a certain amount of justification.

Questions frequently asked are:

1. If a college is accredited by North Central, shouldn't such accreditation satisfy the requirement for recognition?

   I believe I have already addressed myself to that question.

2. May a plan be established under which visitation by North Central and the State Board coincide?

   The policies and procedures of the State Board are flexible enough to allow a joint or concurrent visitation to a junior college by the State Board and the North Central Association. No formal procedure has been developed for such a visitation schedule. It may well be as time goes on that such arrangements will be worked out between the North Central Association, the State Board, and the colleges.

3. Does the recognition function of the State Board demean the colleges?

   My hope is that the recognition program be constructive - intelligently administered - used to strenghten and enhance the mission of the colleges.

The extent to which a junior college district enjoys autonomy in the governance of its institution and the effect of recognition on procedures on the exercise of autonomy is frequently questioned.

The State Board, as of this date, to the best of my knowledge, considers the colleges to have sole authority in the following matters.

Selection of staff
Staff organization
Salaries
Budgets

In fact, all of the powers and duties stipulated in Article III are sole powers and duties insofar as they are not limited in the language of the statute.

Responsibility for the administration and operation of junior college districts is vested in the district junior college board and its staff. Governance of the college is a duty and power of the elected board of the district. The board is charged with the responsibility for the operation of the college, the employment of staff, the selection of site, approval of program, determination of contractural status of all staff, and all other governing and policy making matters necessary to the functioning of the college and in accordance with the provisions of the Public Junior College Act, the Board of Higher Education Act, and other applicable laws. Administration and teaching is vested in staff employed by the district board. Staff operations are guided by the provisions of the Public Junior College Act, the Board of Higher Education Act, other applicable laws and the rules and regulations of the board.

Initiative at the local level is basic to the operation of the Illinois junior college system. New districts are proposed by local petition. Districts are created by local referendum. Governing boards are elected by the citizens within a district. All staff are employed by the board. Sites are searched and selected by the board. Proposed programs are initiated within the district. Budgets are prepared, approved and adopted within the district. Buildings are planned by the district. Scope of curriculum, quality of teaching, character of a college are determined by the strength of the district boards, its staff and the will of the citizens.

Junior college boards and their staff perform their duties with a considerable amount of autonomy. Autonomy within a junior college district, however, like autonomy within any other state institution of higher education, is limited because the institution is a part of a coordinated state system. The administration of the college and exercise of various functions are subject to guidance, regulation, control, by other responsible agencies, primarily the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education.

Sites are selected by the districts but their purchase is subject to approval by the Illinois Junior College Board. New programs are initiated and proposed by the institution but are subject to approval by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. Campus development and building projects are planned and developed at the district level but are subject to the approval of the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education. The administration of a college must be conducted in accordance with the statutes and with standards and criteria established by the Illinois Junior College Board and the Board of Higher Education.

The Illinois Junior College Board and its staff are seeking to perform the recognition function in coordination with other accrediting and licensing agencies, both governmental and independent. We are attempting to perform intelligently, fairly and responsibly. Our hope is that we will rise above your expectations.

Policies and Procedures on Evaluation and Recognition of Illinois Public Junior Colleges

The following policies and procedures for the evaluation and recognition of Illinois public junior colleges are pursuant to the provisions of Article II of the Public Junior College Act, approved July 15, 1965, as amended.

I. ANNUAL RECOGNITION

A. The completed "Application for Recognition" from each campus will be filed annually with the State Board. Primary authority for the evaluation of data contained in this document is delegated to a staff member with primary responsibility for evaluation and recognition.

B. The "Report of Selected Data and Characteristics of Illinois Public Junior Colleges" will continue to be prepared on an annual basis. This report will assume an increasingly important role in the evaluative process. The State Board encourages the continuous improvement of this study and maximum utilization of it by all concerned persons, organizations and institutions.

C. An annual staff workshop at which members of the staff of the State Board would share their knowledge and experience regarding the operation of the various colleges will be held. Basic responsibility for procurement and preparation of data to assist in the evaluative process at this workshop rests with the staff persons with primary responsibility for recognition.

II. CONTINUOUS EVALUATION

The staff of the State Board is expected to be involved in continuous evaluation of public junior colleges. Data for this evaluation may be made available to the staff from various sources. In addition to the Application for Recognition, common sources of data are staff visitations, reports in news media, and communications from and with the college - including such reports as self-evaluation studies conducted by the college staff and voluntarily made available to the staff of the State Board.

III. FORMAL VISITATION

A. Introductory Statement

It is the policy of the State Board that while formal visitation is evaluative in nature, its basic function is to offer suggestions possible of implementation and which promise to make a positive contribution to the educational program of the institution.

Adopted by the Illinois Junior College Board
May 10, 1968

It is logical to assume, therefore, that colleges may expect the full support of the State Board in the common cause of extending educational opportunities beyond the high school to the citizens of Illinois. It follows also that recognition - while a legal responsibility of the State Board - is a reasonable expectation of each public junior college which

(1) Operates within the framework of Illinois Statutes and Common Law,
(2) Operates according to commonly accepted ethical standards, and
(3) is committed to excellence in educational program and comprehensiveness in curricular offerings.

B. Procedure

1. Each college shall receive a formal visitation at intervals not to exceed every fifth year.

2. Formal visitation of colleges may be scheduled at intervals of less than five years providing:

   a. It is the judgment of the staff that such visitation is desirable or necessary, or
   b. A request by the college for a visitation is received.

C. Responsibilities

1. The Illinois Junior College Board will:

   a. Determine the schedule of visitation to include all operating junior colleges and determine the year that each is to receive formal visitation.

   b. Provide a staff member to serve as secretary to the visitation committee.

   c. Assign a visiting team for each visitation from a list submitted to it by the junior colleges by procedure yet to be determined.

   d. Select from the visitation team one of its members to serve as chairman.

   e. Make available to the members of the appointed visiting committee copies of all reports requested by it at least 30 days prior to the visitation.

   f. Collect from the visitation team written reports within one week after the visit is completed, assemble, edit and submit same forthwith to the Illinois Junior College Board, the college and each member of the visitation team.

   g. Reimburse the members of the visitation team for necessary expenses.

2. The visitation team will:

    a. Through the secretary, prepare the agenda and make other determinations concerning the scope and nature of the visitation.

    b. Determine and through the secretary request reports and other necessary data to be provided by the college prior to the visitation.

    c. Prepare written reports as it deems necessary for submission to the secretary.

3. The college will:

    a. Assist members of the visitation team in any manner possible.

    b. Provide a meeting room for use by the visitation team committee.

    c. Make necessary arrangements for the visitation committee to meet with staff, students, the Junior College Board or local advisory committees as the visitation team deems necessary.

    d. Submit to the secretary for distribution to the visitation committee reports required by the visitation committee 45 days prior to the visit.

IV. EVALUATION REPORTS TO THE STATE BOARD

A. An evaluation report will be prepared by the recognition officer for each new college during the first half of its first academic term.

B. An evaluation report will be prepared as indicated above at the culmination of each formal visitation.

C. An evaluation report may be submitted at any time prior to the next formal visitation should unusual circumstances warrant.

* * *

State Coordinating Boards as Related to Recognition and Accreditation

Robert C. Bartlett

I look upon this conference as still another recognition of the growth and significance of the community college, particularly here in Illinois. We have come a long way from the days when two-year colleges were established as extensions of the high schools without any state enabling legislation to formally legitimate their existence. Tremendous social and technological forces, of which all of us here tonight are aware, have contrituted to the growth and development of the community colleges and to their relatively recent emergence as recognized institutions of higher learning. Furthermore, there is growing evidence that these two-year comprehensive institutions will respond to and assist in shaping future society in an even more significant manner.

It is important and satisfying to note the increasing interest and active support on the state level for furthering the community college development and integrating these institutions into the total pattern of higher education. The passage of the Illinois Public Junior College Act of 1965 as the culmination of approximately twenty-eight years of legislative interest by this state in the two-year college is a hallmark of such state-level support.

Tonight we are here to consider a key element in the effort of the state to accept more responsibility for fostering the community college; the state-level mechanisms established to coordinate these institutions and to integrate them into the main stream of the state's higher educational system. It is significant that, among the other stimulating features of the 1965 Act, Illinois chose to vest the necessary state-level coordinating functions in a body whose sole interest was community college development, the Illinois Junior College Board, and to foster the necessary integration by relating this Board to the overall Board of Higher Education.

However, while this tremendous educational surge needs coordination and financial support from the state, it does appear that new problems involving state-local relationships have been introduced with the advent of coordinated state-wide developments of community colleges such as the movement here in Illinois. Questions regarding control and communication have been and are being raised in an attempt to draw the fine line between state coordination and institutional administration. I recognize that answers to these questions are being sought and many have been found here in Illinois over the past three years. My task, as I understand it, is to attempt, in some small way, to assist in this vital inquiry be viewing these issues from the standpoint of those involved in assisting and evaluating institutions of higher learning on a regional and national basis.

Because they represent and have experience with such a broad spectrum of education, general accrediting associations such as the North Central Association should be and are in a position to speak to these questions regarding state coordination. While the Association deals only with individual institutions, the impact of state level policy upon the institutions' operations can hardly be overlooked in adequately assisting or evaluating the institutions themselves.

If we are to concern ourselves with the views of the North Central Association, as a representative general accrediting association, we must be sure that we understand the philosophy and operational content of the Association's accrediting activity, especially for our present purposes, in the field of higher education.

NCA Philosophy and Operation

As a voluntary, self-governing association of collegiate institutions, the Commission on Colleges and Universities of the North Central Association establishes its own policies and expectations for evaluating and assisting institutions within its own membership and those seeking membership. Thus, the evaluation and consulting activities of the Commission are carried on by the institutions' peers rather than by a governmental or special interest agency. This mode of operation does result in somewhat of a circular effect in establishment of evaluative expectations for new dimensions of institutional operation where firm notions of good practice have not completely emerged. In other words, the expectations which the Commission is developing with regard to the effective operational role of a community college in a state-wide system have been evolving from the experience gained in actual evaluations of institutions within such systems. Broader, more inclusive expectations will certainly develop from further experience of this nature.

To understand the Commission's position on state policies as they affect community colleges, it must also be recognized that standards, as normally conceived, are not applied in NCA evaluations. Questions have arisen in the recent past, for example, regarding the Commission's position on whether the community colleges should be under a state board of higher education, a separate state junior college board, or the state board of higher education, a separate state junior college board, or the state board of education. It is important to note that the Commission does not prescribe a specific pattern of organizational structure for a state system. In our pluralistic society it is generally accepted that a variety of types of institutions are needed to meet the various needs of society. Concomitantly, viable programs of education may be conducted within various organizational patterns.

With these understandings of the NCA approach as a context, we may turn to the Commission positions which have and will continue to evolve regarding state coordination as it affects the community college.

Guidelines

It should first be noted that the Commission, and all of us here I am sure, recognize that in the world of today interinstitutional coordination has emerged as necessary and desirable. State-wide planning and the coordinated implementation of such plans are vital to prevent unnecessary duplication of programs and services such as certain of the occupational programs offered in community colleges. Other important functions of such coordinating efforts would certainly include providing a rational approach to legislatures for state appropriations, consolidated general long-range planning, and a clearing-house for vital statistical and planning information within and between states. In other words, a state can and should establish broad policy which reflects the "broad picture" of the state needs; stimulates and perhaps even demands that individual institutions develop rational and integrated educational, facility, and financial plans which can be related to the broader state plans and within which later broad decisions by the institutions can be defended; and state policy which ensures effective use of the state's resources for community college education.

The Commission also recognizes that the state coordinating body will usually be legally charged with evaluating the community colleges, at least in the early stages of their development. Such evaluations may serve not only as the basis for state recognition for state support but to assist the institutions and the coordinating body in establishing a common understanding of the educational quality on which to proceed. While the Commission has no right or role in such state evaluations, it would encourage the use of broad expectations or guidelines which have been developed in cooperation with local institutions and which do not become overly restrictive. When the community colleges of a state begin to seek general accreditation, the Commission welcomes communication with the state coordinating body and encourages the institutions to share all Commission reports submitted to them with the appropriate coordinating agencies.

As important as the forms of state policy and responsibility are, however, the Commission feels that the plan for coordination and planning should promote rather than inhibit an institution's efforts to fulfill its task. In this regard the Commission has joined with the other five regional accrediting commissions of higher education through a Federation in establishing a "Policy Statement on Institutional Integrity" which states in part:

> To carry out the essential commitment of pursuit of truth and its communication to others requires than an institution of higher learning have primary responsibility for the direct management of its affairs - specifying its goals, selecting and retaining faculty, admitting students, establishing curricula, utilizing resources of the institution, and fixing its fields of service.

It is recognized of course that these responsibilities should be carried out within a general framework set by whatever coordinating agency may exist.

The view of general accrediting associations regarding the desirable nature of state policy is further illustrated in another Federation document entitled "External Budget Control."

> When an institution depends for its support on an external agency-state, church, or other public or private agency - the external agency will determine the amount of support it will provide and may approximately indicate in broad terms the categories for which support is provided and the amounts. The external agency should not, through line items control or other means, determine in detail how the funds are to be spent. This is a function of the governing board and the institutions officers.

From these statements it can be clearly seen that the Commission views the maintenance of a high degree of institutional autonomy as vital to the community college's ability to fulfill its task as a true institution of higher learning; while, at the same time recognizing the importance and desirability of broad state coordination and planning. Erickson in his article entitled "Illinois Balances Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy" in the March, 1968, issue of the Junior College Journal calls this phenomenon "creative state-local tension." It appears that the development of such a form of "tension" will require close liaison between the state and local institutions as these concepts of coordination and planning are refined.

While the Illinois efforts to establish the appropriate "creative tension" seem to be progressing well, continued involvement of the community colleges in the development of new state policies in this area seems vital. In states where such involvement has been lacking a serious "power vacuum" seems to have developed with the resulting emergence of overly restrictive state policies. As would be obvious from my previous remarks, the Commission takes strong exception to state policies which infringe too deeply upon such administrative areas as the nature of the institutions' internal administrative structure, teaching loads and salaries, selection and retention of faculty, and curriculum design.

A specific illustration drawn from the area of curricular design should provide my final clarification of the nature of the Commission's concerns with regard to state coordination.

One of the basic eligibility requirements for membership in the NCA is that the institution base its programs on a core of liberal arts or general education. The commission has taken the position that general education should be included in the occupational programs as well as the transfer programs offered in community colleges. Like other groups in the field, such as the Engineering Council on Professional Development, the Commission argues that occupational programs should not only prepare a student for immediate job entry. Changing technology demands that the student have sufficient general background to enable him to remain productive in the future. The college also has an obligation to further prepare the student to take his place as an active, literate, and informed citizen in society.

The Commission does not feel that the community college should necessarily provide the same kind of general education experiences for the occupational students as are provided for the transfer students. The general education should be appropriate to the goals of these students but, at the same time, get them involved with ideas and concepts drawn not only from the disciplines upon which their program speciality is based, but others as well. In an engineering technology program, for example, the student should deal with general communications and the social sciences as well as mathematics and physical sciences.

The Commission does not prescribe the amount or specific nature of the general education in occupational programs, but does expect the institution to develop its own rationale for such curriculum design and develop its program accordingly. Thus far, it has been found that community colleges which seem to be adequately providing such experiences have had to devote approximately 20-30% of their programs to general education as distinct from specialization or related courses. However, this is not an absolute figure. It should also be noted that the qualifications of the faculty teaching these courses should be appropriate. In general this means that a Master's degree in the subject field is expected.

This Commission position on general education seems to run contrary to or at least cause some difficulty with state policy in some states. In Illinois, the problem seems to lie in the fact that the control of federal reimbursement for vocational-technical programs is under the vocational division of the Department of Public Instruction and not within the direct purview of the Junior College Board. The necessary delicate articulation between these two bodies and local institutions is complicated by the fact that judgments must be made on the state level on a course by course basis because of the federal reimbursement dimension. This necessary break with the more desirable state-level program approval mode must be handled carefully if the institutions are to retain their ability to develop curriculum which are in keeping with individual and local needs.

Conclusion

I have attempted to clarify some of the issues which are of current concern to the Commission on Colleges and Universities with regard to coordinating boards, state policy, and their affect on community colleges. I hope that I have adequately conveyed the idea that the Commission does not attempt to dictate what state coordinating policy should be. The Commission has the same goals that you and the state have in this field and we hope that by working together these goals can be realized.

* * *

Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges

Special Business Meeting
October 26, 1968, Rockford, Illinois

The following reports were given at the Special Business Meeting of the Association on Saturday afternoon, October 26, 1968:

1. Financial Report - James D. Broman, Executive Director of the Association, announced that the Auditor's Report for the fiscal year 1967-1968 had been received. It substantiates the Treasurer's Report as shown below, but in considerable more detail:

RECEIPTS - July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968:

Regular Dues & Assessments from Member Colleges	$29,079.80	
Special Assessment-Class I Public Junior Colleges	13,200.00	
Affiliate and Individual Memberships	6,860.00	
Grants from Foundations and Others	1,500.00	
Conferences, Workshops, and Misc. Income	10,360.71	
Total Receipts		$61,000.51

DISBURSEMENTS - July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968:

Salaries, fringe benefits, etc. ($27,500)	$26,707.66	
Conferences, meetings, and travel ($8,500)	18,485.95	
Postage ($1,000)	271.09	
Publications, printing, & duplication ($2,000)	2,701.36	
Telephone and telegraph ($900)	1,498.58	
Office supplies and equipment ($500)	554.93	
Dues and subscriptions ($200)	435.00	
Rent and utilities ($800)	12.50	
Contingency Reserve ($1,000)	7,218.75	
Total Disbursements		$57,885.82

INCOME OVER DISBURSEMENTS, FISCAL YEAR 1967-68	3,114.69
Transferred from Chicago City Bank to the Merchandise National Bank of Chicago, Jan. 12, 1968	3,883.44
Cash in Merchandise National Bank, June 30, 1968	$ 6,998.13
Cash in Association Office, June 30, 1968	125.00
TOTAL CASH IN BANK AND AN ASSOCIATION OFFICE AT YEAR-END, June 30, 1968	$ 7,123.13

*Figures in parentheses are amounts budgeted for 1967-68 fiscal year.

Disbursements were held within the total budget of $42,500.00 adopted by the 1967 Annual Meeting if disbursements for conferences, legal expenses, and other miscellaneous items not provided for in the budget are discounted. These additional expenses, amounting to more than $16,000.00 are offset by corresponding income also not contemplated for the 1967-68 fiscal year.

The report of Warren W. Wilson, Certified Public Accountant, will be sent to each member college.

2. 1969 Annual Meeting - It was announced that the Hotel Pere Marquette in Peoria, Illinois will be the location of the 1969 Annual Meeting of the Association. The meeting will be combined with an Illinois Junior College Board program, similar to the present Fall Conference, and will be called the Fourth Annual Illinois Junior College Conference. The date of the conference will be May 8-10, 1969.

This change has been made by the Board of Directors of the Association for several reasons. First, it was agreed that each of the four divisions, and especially the Student and Faculty Divisions, needed time to organize and plan program early in the college year and this could be accomplished better by having the divisions meet separately in the Fall. Second, expenses for attending two statewide meetings could be held down by this shift to one conference in the Spring jointly sponsored by the Association and the State Board. Third, it was felt that since election of board members is held in April of each year that newly elected board members would benefit greatly from attendance at a statewide meeting soon after their election. Lastly, it has become evident that considerable lead time is needed by the divisions to develop program, formulate proposals, draft resolutions and recommendations, and to otherwise prepare for the Annual Meeting. The same is true regarding the Association. Committees must be appointed and must meet to make recommendations for action. For these, and other important reasons, the new schedule of meetings has been adopted.

3. Credentials Committee Report - John Lewis, Chairman of the Committee, reported on the work of the Credentials Committee in establishing a registration procedure for delegates and alternates, providing for appropriate identification, determining seating at business meetings, voting procedures, appointing Sergeant-at-arms for each division, allowing for caucuses, employing of a parliamentarian, and other practices and procedures adopted by the Committee.

On the basis of procedures established by the Credentials Committee and approved by the Board of Directors of the Association, the role of colleges was called to determine voting delegations from each campus. The roll call was as follows:

College	Votes
Belleville Area College	3
Black Hawk College - Moline	3
Black Hawk College - Kewanee	0
Chicago City College	10
Amundsen-Mayfair Campus	1
Bogan Campus	0
Crane Campus	2
Fenger Campus	1
Loop Campus	2
Southeast Campus	3
T. V. Campus	0
Wilson Campus	3
Wright Campus	3

Danville Junior College	3
College of DuPage	1
Elgin Community College	4
William Rainey Harper College	4
Highland Community College	3
Illinois Central College	2
Illinois Valley Community College	3
Joliet Junior College	3
Kaskaskia College	3
Kankakee Community College	2
Kishwaukee College	3
College of Lake County	2
Lake Land College	4
Lincoln Land Junior College	4
John A. Logan College	0
McHenry County College	2
Moraine Valley Community College	3
Morton College	2
Olney Central College	0
Parkland College	1
Prairie State College	3
Rend Lake Junior College	3
Rock Valley College	4
Carl Sandburg College	3
Sauk Valley College	4
Shawnee Community College	0
Southeastern Illinois College	0
Spoon River College	1
Thornton Junior College	3
Triton College	1
Wabash Valley College	3
Waubonsee Community College	4
Central YMCA Community College	3
Felician College	0
Kendall College	2
Lincoln College	1
Robert Morris College	3
Total--	118

The following resolutions and recommendations were adopted by the delegates to the Special Business Meeting of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges:

RESOLUTION 10-68-A

WHEREAS, Dr. Lyman A. Glenny as first associate and then as Executive Director of the Board of Higher Education has had major responsibility for development of the Illinois Master Plan for Higher Education and for implementation of the provisions of the Plan, and

WHEREAS, he has combined innovative practices with leadership to promote the cause of higher education in the State of Illinois, and

WHEREAS, the Illinois community and junior college movement in Illinois has been advanced by his efforts,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges convey its gratitude to Dr. Lyman A. Glenny and extend to him best wishes for success in his new appointment with the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley.

RESOLUTION 10-68-B

WHEREAS, Dr. Clifford G. Erickson has given long years of service and leadership to the junior college movement in the State of Illinois, and

WHEREAS, his contributions have included service as president of the Illinois Junior College Association as well as participation as a spokesman for the Illinois Junior College Movement on many State and national committees, and

WHEREAS, he has given unselfishly of his creative ability in defining and solving problems of vital concern to the community and junior college movement,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges express its profound appreciation to Dr. Clifford G. Erickson and extend to him its best wishes for success in his position as Chancellor of the San Mateo Junior College District of California.

RESOLUTION 10-68-C

WHEREAS, The Third Annual Illinois Junior College Conference has provided an opportunity for the community and junior colleges to convene for the purpose of investigation, study and communication concerning issues of vital importance to community and junior college education, and

WHEREAS, the success of the Conference is largely attributable to the imaginative and efficient planning undertaken by the Illinois Junior College Board and its staff, to the Executive Board of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges and its Executive Director, Mr. James D. Broman, and the host colleges, Highland Community College and Rock Valley College,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges thank the Illinois Junior College Board and its staff, to the Executive Board of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges and its Executive Director, Mr. James D. Broman, and the host colleges, Highland Community College and Rock Valley College, for their efforts in contributing to a successful Third Annual Illinois Junior College Conference.

RESOLUTION 10-68-D

WHEREAS, the continued development of the community and junior college movement in the State of Illinois requires a high level of cooperation and communication between the community and junior colleges and representatives of the business and industrial community, and

WHEREAS, such communication and cooperation has been fostered by the creation of a Business and Industry Community College Council for the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and

WHEREAS, a number of business and industrial firms within the State of Illinois have become members of this Council thereby furthering the purposes of the Association for their counsel and support.

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges conveys to the members of its Business and Industry Community College Council sincere appreciation for their counsel and support.

RESOLUTION 10-68-E

WHEREAS close liaison and cooperation between the community and junior colleges and the universities and four-year colleges of the State are essential to the articulation of related educational programs and in effecting successful transfer of junior college students to these institutions, and

WHEREAS many universities and four-year colleges both as institutions and through their individual staff members have become affiliate members of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges thereby facilitating close liaison and cooperation between themselves and the community and junior colleges, and

WHEREAS the results of this affiliation have been manifested in active participation in the conferences and workshops of Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges and through the development of on-going co-operative programs with the community and junior colleges,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges recognize and commend the universities and four-year colleges of Illinois and their staff members for the enthusiastic support and cooperation which they have given to the community and junior colleges of the State.

RECOMMENDATION 10-68-1

WHEREAS there is lack of understanding of the political, economic, social and cultural contributions of black people, and

WHEREAS this failure of understanding results from the lack of traditional college curriculums to include information about black people, and

WHEREAS the Illinois community and junior colleges provide a unique opportunity to foster understanding through the development of new courses and curriculums,

THEREFORE, be it recommended that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges encourage its member institutions to give appropriate attention to the need for the broadening of curriculum offerings and course contents in order to promote understanding of the social and cultural contributions of black people, and

Be it further recommended that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges designate funds to support the development of book lists including books by black authors which can be used to promote such understanding.

RECOMMENDATION 10-68-2

WHEREAS there is a growing recognition that students desire to have a larger voice in the formulation of policy in higher education, and

WHEREAS this role of the student in the formulation of policy is set forth in the Joint Statement of Rights and Freedoms of Students, and

WHEREAS this statement has been approved and endorsed by representatives of the National Students Association, American Council on Education, and American Association of Junior Colleges and other nationally recognized associations, and

WHEREAS the Joint Statement of Rights and Freedoms of Students can serve as a guide to the development of institutional policies by which students can be granted a more responsible role in the affairs of the institution,

THEREFORE, be it recommended that member institutions of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges be encouraged to use the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students as a guide in fostering student involvement in the formulation of institutional policy.

RESOLUTION 10-68-1

WHEREAS the Faculty Division of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges is convinced that continued academic study is vital for continued professional growth of junior college faculty members,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that to provide for continued professional growth, local college boards should be encouraged to reimburse faculty members for tuition and fees at a rate established by the local board. Such reimbursements should be granted for study in the faculty member's academic area or in an area that will improve his service to the college.

RESOLUTION 10-68-2

WHEREAS the Faculty Division of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges is convinced that faculty attendance at professional conferences and conventions is a vital link in continued professional growth for junior college faculty members,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that to provide for continuing professional growth, local college boards should be encouraged to reimburse faculty members for conference and convention fees and all reasonable expenses incurred as an attendant at such conferences and conventions.

RESOLUTION 10-68-3

WHEREAS the Faculty Division of the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges is convinced that junior college members may improve their service to the colleges by participating in special programs that may require absence from campus,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that to provide for continued professional growth, local college boards should be encouraged to adopt a policy of granting professional leaves of absence. Such leaves may be granted for advanced study, exchange teaching or assignment, travel, governmental service, or any other professional experience which is related to the field of teaching or which will improve a faculty member's professional competence. Such leaves shall not be construed as a break in service and/or benefits for any reason.

RESOLUTION 10-68-4

WHEREAS the Constitution of the State of Illinois was designed primarily for the rural economy of the 19th Century, and

WHEREAS Illinois stands today as a leader in the nation, not only in agriculture, but also in education, finance, export, commerce, industry, and public service, and

WHEREAS it is agreed that changing patterns of society, growing population, heavy concentrations around metropolitan areas, increasing demands for education and public services, and innovation and change in every facet of life, including government, demand extensive modernization of the State's Constitution,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges support a Constitutional Convention for the State of Illinois and urge each registered voter to exercise his right and responsibility on this issue.

RESOLUTION 10-68-6

WHEREAS the Illinois Board of Higher Education has seen fit to establish guidelines limiting the financial participation of the State in the construction of parking facilities for institutions of higher education, and

WHEREAS the community colleges as well as the new three-year institutions are established by law as commuter institutions, and

WHEREAS many communities do not have adequate public transportation thereby necessitating that students provide their own transportation, and

WHEREAS adequate parking facilities are essential to accomodate students who thus provide their own transportation to campus, and

WHEREAS it is the intent of the Master Plan for Higher Education to assure low cost opportunity for higher education at the local level, and

WHEREAS the imposition of parking fees as established in the guidelines would act as a deterrent to this end,

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Illinois Association of Community and Junior Colleges respectfully request that the Illinois Board of Higher Education reconsider its decision to limit state participation in financing construction of parking facilities, and further requests the Board to distinguish between the different types of institutions of higher education recognizing the special needs of the commuter community colleges and senior three-year institutions.

REGISTRATION

ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD MEMBERS

Frank F. Fowle, Chairman
John K. Cox, Vice Chairman
Richard G. Browne
Lee O. Dawson and Mrs. Dawson
Gertrude C. Kahn
Annabel C. Prescott

ILLINOIS JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD STAFF, 544 Iles Park Place, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Gerald W. Smith, Executive Secretary
G. Robert Darnes and Mrs. Darnes
Albert H. Martin
Carl E. Thornblad
F. C. Tompkins and Mrs. Tompkins
Germaine Aikman
Edith Wilson
Kenneth H. Lemmer

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES, 211 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60606

James Broman and Mrs. Broman
Bea Douglas

BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 300 East Monroe Street, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Donald Winandy
Arthur D. Browne
Robert Marsh

BOARD OF REGENTS, 909 Myers Building, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Frank Matsler

BOARD OF GOVERNORS, 222 College Street, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Joseph V. Totaro

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, 302 State Office Building, Springfield, Illinois 62706

Parmer L. Ewing
Ralph Rohling
Hazel J. Kellams

BELLEVILLE AREA COLLEGE, 2555 West Boulevard, Belleville, Illinois 62221

H. J. Haberaecker, President
Henry M. Milander
Gordon Stone
Wayne Stumph
A. J. Woods
Clyde Washburn
Jan Milligan
Roger Crane
Farrell E. Wilson
Gene Brandt
Otis L. Miller
Tom Jewett
Terry True
Mike Sullivan
Ron Schikowski
Janie Bloomer
Joy Ovrebo
Kathy Burch
Sandy Thomas

BLACK HAWK COLLEGE, 1001 Sixteenth Street, Moline, Illinois 61265

Alban E. Reid, President
Charles J. Carlsen
Charles Laws
Barton Schiermeyer
William Forrest
Thomas Batell
James Brunner
John Frey
Lawrence Ladwig
Virginia Heiar
Kathy Miller
Donald Shaver
George Young

BLACK HAWK COLLEGE EAST, 111 North East Street, Kewanee, Illinois 61443

Max Wingett, Dean
Jim Pitts
Ken Maguire
Fred Stahl
Dick Doty
Tom Turman
Phil Goodwin

CHICAGO CITY COLLEGE, 180 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60601

Oscar E. Shabat, Chancellor
Turner H. Trimble
John F. Grede
I. B. Slutsky
Hyman Chausow
Edith Barry
J. Stuart Doyle
Donald W. Hill
Henry Moughamian
Andrew S. Korim
Philip R. Luhmann
Louis D. Audi
R. J. Lill
William O. Broad and Mrs. Broad
(Foreign Visitors)

AMUNDSEN-MAYFAIR CAMPUS, 4626 North Knox Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60630

Theodore G. Phillips, Dean
John W. Gianopulos
Bernard Tarshis
Clifford Peterson
Leslie Burton
John Powers
Rosalie Weis
Elizabeth Taylor
Annette Maro
Larry Earlix

BOGAN CAMPUS, 3939 West 79th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60652

William L. Stevens, Dean
Robert H. Krupp
Wesley E. Soderquist
William P. Conway

CRANE CAMPUS, 2250 West VanBuren Street, Chicago, Illinois 60612

Helmut Meyerbach, Acting Dean
Frank Banks
Vincent DeLeers
Barbara L. King
Paul Mall
Georgia Elgar
Martha M. Duchun
William Lee
Marion Stiller
Mattie Lewis
Willie Stigall
Henry English
James Howard
Rufus Walls
Douglas Nelson
Robert Clay
Calvin Cook

FENGER CAMPUS, 11220 South Wallace Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60628

Doyle O. Bon Jour, Dean
Ralph A. Hladik

LOOP CAMPUS, 64 East Lake Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601

David Heller, Dean
John P. Donohue
John Tosto
Frank Trunk
Richard J. Kennedy
Mrs. R. Schiff
Ruth Hoffmeyer
Marvin Logan
Frank Short

SOUTHEAST CAMPUS, 8600 South Anthony, Chicago, Illinois 60617

Chester Pachucki, Dean
Howard A. Gordon
Samuel Stalnick
Beryle McNabb
Robert A. Barkley
Edith Barry
Asta E. Bowen
Sylvia T. Johnson
Judith Eaton

T.V. COLLEGE, 5400 N. St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60625

William Grede

WILSON CAMPUS, 7047 South Stewart Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60621

John Pembroke
Kenneth Woodman
Daniel E. Moore
Joan W. Swift
Mavis Hoberg
James Miller
David B. Erikson
Kelsey Keeys
James W. Moore
Pierre Long
Raoul De La Noval
Ewen Akin
James Jeanquenat
Ed Romans
Mrs. D. F. Balsley
Jerry Vaculik
Ronald W. Sreniawski
Irene DuBois
L. E. Henniger
Floyd DuBois
John Lewis
Larry Nash
Lajewel Johnson
Ronald Blumenberg
Molly Bruckner

WRIGHT CAMPUS, 3400 North Austin Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60634

E. V. Clements, Dean
T. S. Sunko
R. M. Runde
Edith Clarke
E. A. Liden
W. Schmidt
I. Cox

DANVILLE JUNIOR COLLEGE, 2000 East Main Street, Danville, Illinois 61832

Mary Miller, President
Elmer Smith
Mary Ann Diller
Lawrence J. Auten
Wilbur Dickson
John Bettag
James Nickell
Felix Wheeler
Bonnie Grant
Teresa Deck

COLLEGE OF DUPAGE, 29W235 Ferry Road, Naperville, Illinois 60540

Rodney Berg, President, and Mrs. Berg
John Paris and Mrs. Paris
Lucile Friedli
Donald Dame
James Godshalk
George Seaton
Wesley Johnson
John Anthony
J. Edward Searby
Stephen Groszos
William Gooch
Con Patsavas
George Kautz
Arthur Anderson
LeRoy Stoldt
David Maleb
Conrad Szuberla
James Love
Lon Gault
Joseph Palmieri
Don Preston
Mike Soto
Larry Lemkau
James Williams
Roger Whitaker
  (Freshman Representative)
Ken Fox
  ("Courier" Reporter)

ELGIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 373 East Chicago Street, Elgin, Illinois 60120

Mrs. Albert Simon
Dean Chipman
Charles Medearis
Eugene Pint
Samuel Slick
John Bradburn
Duane Nelson
Jack McCrary
Judith Strattan
Kevin O'Neal
Robert Sears
Chris Skoczek
Cynthia Eberhardt

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE, Algonquin & Roselle Roads, Palatine, Illinois 60067

Robert E. Lahti, President
Mrs. Fred Nicklas
John Haas
Richard L. Johnson
John Tompson
Kenneth Andeen
Frank Borelli
Michael Bartos
Joe Tillotson
George Voegel
Sean Ryan
Lori West
Milton C. Hansen

HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 511 West Stephenson Street, Freeport, Illinois 61032

Kenneth E. Borland, President
Louise Neyhart
Robert J. Rimington
H. C. Mitchell
Delbert Scheider
Lyle A. Rachuy
Richard D. Fagan
Josef Spudich
James R. Davis
John E. McClellan
Virginia E. Stanley
Pat Conter
Charles Jenkins
Phillip Gordon
Larry Boyce
Thomas E. Myers
Robert J. Lewis
Roger Kreuzer
Sharon Zamkovitz
Kenneth Kiser
Paula Sayers
Richard A. Sennet
James M. Berberet
Don Capes
Audrey Anderson
Robert Fecke
Vicki Newberry
Geary Buckwalter
Mike McWilliams
Pat Daley
Al Unger
Cindy Blair

ILLINOIS CENTRAL COLLEGE, P. O. Box 2400, East Peoria, Illinois 61611

John E. Dalton
Dorothy Herm
Martin Leddy
M. C. Stratton
Evan Jackson
Dale Williams
William Martinie
Stanley Niehaus
Gilbert Baechler
Thomas A. Juravich
Fred W. Soady
Marjorie Martin
Jean Aldag
Jim Troutman
William NcNett
William Fogal
Sarah Allen
Donald Aldag
James Pleasant
Joan Likes
Mrs. Vaughn Frisk
Doug Bowers
Margaret Bahnfleth
Jim Tolly
Cliff Ozmun
Donald R. Marine
Richard H. Richardson
Lynn Jermac
Margaret Ellis
Fred Weber
Steve Roof
Pam Tate
Ric Baxter
Candy Piskorski
Pat Kneer
Peyton Harris
Tim Elder
Randy Hunt
Dave Jennings
Janet Gay
Richard Goss

ILLINOIS VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Rural Route One, Oglesby, Illinois 61348

Kenneth H. Freeman, President
Barbara L. Edgerley
Christ Troupis
R. E. Trobaugh
F. Martin Hole
James Williams
Al Wisgoski
Louis Borio
Robert Mueller
Dean May
Nick Yeazel
John Prendergast

JOLIET JUNIOR COLLEGE, 201 East Jefferson, Joliet, Illinois 60432

Elmer Rowley, President
Cecil Ingmire
Ronald Whitaker
Sam Saxon and Mrs. Saxon
Victor Scott
H. Allen Holler
William Glasscock
James J. Hines
Roger Gordon
Henry Pillard
Douglas Graham
Joseph Borgen
Walter F. Zaida
Susan Wood
Vera Smith
Patricia Sippel
Joseph Piland
Maynard Boudreau
Everett C. Nelsen
Robert Burke
John Corradetti
Earl Kurtz
Patrick Asher
Earl D. Henslee
Lottie Skidmore
Duane Converse
Charles Warthen
Pryce Keagle
Larry McCure
Fred Fonseca
Carol Clennon

KANKAKEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 367 South Schuyler, Kankakee, Illinois 60901

Robert Zimmer, President
Ralph Francis
Kenneth Wiser
Merlin Karlock
Jack Samlin
Paul Ebeling
John C. Veatch
David Ferris
Gregg Figgins
Dorothy Tayrien
Charles Hewitt
Dan Brauer
Writesman Long
Margaret Reeves
Barry Cann
John Palider
Jane Douglas
Vonna Deulen

KASKASKIA COLLEGE, Shattuc Road, Centralia, Illinois 62801

Eugene McClintock, President
Thelma Bailey
David Stedelin
Verle Besant
Joseph Heimann
Clinton Wedekemper
Virgil Bolerjack
Duane Kessler
Glenn Champ
Dale Musselman
Dorothy Pedtke
Mary Ann Bohbrink
Lewis Dobbs
King Lambird
Kevin Pelaez
Tom Freeman

KISHWAUKEE COLLEGE, Malta, Illinois 60150

W. Lamar Fly, President, and Mrs. Fly
Kenneth O. Smith
Norbert J. Berning
John Goodwin
William E. O'Brian
Gudelia Fox
Robert L. Smith
Clifford M. Cleland
Heather Marks
Patty Herring

COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY, 2615 West Washington, Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Richard Erzen, President
Herbert Wesner
Oby Cowan
Ernest Dear
Russell Bloyer
Robert Hoekstra

LAKE LAND COLLEGE, 1921 Richmond, Mattoon, Illinois 61938

Virgil Judge, President
Tom Nolan
Edward Resch
John Helton
Jack Browning
James Becker
John Cox, Jr.
L. K. Voris
Don Stuckey
Bill Rogers
Michael Sullivan

LINCOLN LAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 3865 So. 6th - Frontage Road, Springfield, Illinois 62703

Robert L. Poorman, President
Charles Long
Eldon Greenwood
Dean Kessler
Henry Brown
Fred Speece
Edwin Fitzgibbon
Jerry Hertel
Christopher Heid

JOHN A. LOGAN COLLEGE, 111 East Cherry Street, Herrin, Illinois 62948

Nathan A. Ivey, President

MCHENRY COUNTY COLLEGE, 6200 Northwest Highway, Box 415, Crystal Lake, Illinois 60014

Forest Etheredge, President
Ted Huizenga
George Cowgill
F. Robert Mealey
Maury Bynum
Brian Koleto
Michael Reid
Mary Ellen Wright

MORAINE VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 4740 W. 95th Street, Oak Lawn, Illinois 60453

Frank A. Belle, Jr.
Richard DeCosmo
H. Boadway
T. Richardson
T. Zimanzl
Robert VanRaes
Peter Frigo
David N. Downs
Nancy Donlon

MORTON COLLEGE, 2423 South Austin, Cicero, Illinois 60650

J. Philip Dalby, President
Edward J. Kosell
Callison H. Simon
Vincent Cerveny
Robert C. Bergstrom
J. A. Mejdrich
Robert W. Witzke
Stanley C. Richards
Robert Finder
Frank Naccarato

OLNEY CENTRAL COLLEGE, 405 North West Street, Olney, Illinois 62450

James S. Spencer, President,
and Mrs. Spencer
Gail Lathrop
Art Mills
Mike Elder

PARKLAND COLLEGE, 2 Main Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820

William Staerkel, President
C. W. Barnes
Donald Swank
Donald H. Smith
Richard Karch
Don Grothe
Phillip R. Walker
Paul Thompson
James Nelson
Shirley Clausen
Sue Speiser
Daniel Vogler
Douglas Burgham
James Montoya
Micki Balzer
John Waldbillig
Donald Lookingbill
Carol Korte
Katana Flanagan

PRAIRIE STATE COLLEGE, 10th Street and Dixie Highway, Box 487,
Chicago Heights, Illinois 60411

Richard W. Hostrop, President
Richard B. Jensen
Henry Nicolai
Bruce Enselman
Joan Gregg
Daniel O'Rourke
Richard H. Jones
Dave Patrizi
Jim Draper
Julie Halverson
Stan Homik
Tom Cvercko
Doug Alessandrini
Larry LoBue
Debby Lewis
Michael Shoemaker
Bob Hubsch
Dave Manners
Mike Sabo
Steve Rice

REND LAKE JUNIOR COLLEGE, 315 South Seventh Street, Mt. Vernon, Illinois 62864

J. M. Snyder, President
Wayne Arnold
Howard Rawlinson
Larry White

ROCK VALLEY COLLEGE, 3301 North Mulford Road, Rockford, Illinois 61111

Clifford G. Erickson, President, and Mrs. Erickson
Hugh Hammerslag
Vivian Hickey
Robert Appel
J. B. Munson
John T. Queenan
Eloise Eshbaugh
Ronald Hallstrom
William Hinrichs
Victor Serri
David W. Hinde
Jim McIntosh
Tom Lounsbury
David VanWinkle
Elizabeth Peterson
Lloyd Hoshaw
David Arnold
Dorothy Butts
Hazel Hassan
Leslie L. Kingsbury
David McCurdy
Maxine Saudargas
Tom Mitchell
Terrence V. Layng
Ed Wolfenbarger
Irene Schultz
Rosemary Lotta
Christine Dwyer
Ginnie L. Musso
Elmer Forrest
Patrick Thompson
Mary Jo Morgan
Carl Marinelli
John T. Schou
Nancy Lounsbury
Willis D. Waite
Bob Atchison
Ron Austin
Ron Casola
Diane Heindenreich
Robert Langenberg
Cathlin Callahan
Bill Karr
Pat Quin
Paulette Gridley

CARL SANDBURG COLLEGE, 139 South Cherry Street, Galesburg, Illinois 61401

Eltis Henson, President
David R. Moffet
Benjamin T. Shawver
Marylynn V. Allen
F. William Kelley, Jr.
Robert W. Greene
William E. Burkhardt
Harry Grossman
C. James Burkhart
Dan Burgland
Linda Nuckles
Joan Reveles

SAUK VALLEY COLLEGE, R.R. #1, Dixon, Illinois 61021

Edward J. Sabol, President
E. O. DeWeerth
Warren E. Walder
Clayton R. Schuneman
Catherine R. Perkins
Philip S. Osborn
Ralph Gelander
Elmer J. Kuhn
Barry L. Johnson
Philip Wessels
Roy White
George Stanley
Norman Spencer
Evangeline Shank
Michael Seguin
John Sagmoe
Bentley Robison
Elmer Rice
William Piland
Duane Paulsen
Fred Nesbit
Harold Nelson
Ron Marlier
Marjorie Malone
Tom Lindblade
Kathryn Lillyman
Amy Kellerstrass
Ann Johnson

Maxene Hurley
Don Hokanson
Robert Himelock
Richard Doolen
Ron Hartje
Walter Clevenger
Noah Bunch
Nels Anderson
Fred Anderson
Dennis Fulrath
Kathy Fink
Sandy Peterson
Susan Hunsberger
Bill Bartell
Roger Schinderling
Anne Horton
Bron Himelick
Robert Hill
Edwin Ferree
John Devine
Donald Burton
David Burgett
Noel Adams
George Vrhel
Kevin McKee
Linda Foley
Sandy Kosier
Eugene Jacoby
Paul Bonnell
Vernon Gottel

SHAWNEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, Karnak, Illinois 62956

Loren E. Klaus, President
T. M. Garrett
Louis Horman
Howard Saar

SOUTHEASTERN ILLINOIS COLLEGE, 333 West College, Harrisburg, Illinois 62946

Joseph C. Deaton, President
Jesse Edwards
Larry D. Gentry
Marvin Barnett
Harry G. Moore
Kevin Yocum
Warren D. Tuttle
Harry W. Abell
Robert I. Gregg
James W. Read
Virgil Motsinger
Candy Duncan

SPOON RIVER COLLEGE, 102 East Elm Street, Canton, Illinois 61520

Hearl Bishop, President
W. I. Taylor
James Richmond
Charles Black
Tom Webber
John Dare
Carl Jackson
Mike Chianakas
Harold Huble
Virginia Vasen
Ronald Kahn

THORNTON JUNIOR COLLEGE, 151st Street and Broadway, Harvey, Illinois 60426

Lee E. Dulgar, President
Naomi Dunker
Wayne Willard
Byron Kee
Robert E. Johnson
Smith Brand
Charles Ledbetter
Mary Comegys
Clifton Satterthwaite
Wayne Terwilliger
Ruth Biesboer
Allan Hart
Alice Barkley
Kathy Faber
Herbert Greiner
Robert Anderson
Adelaide Childs
James Sidwell
Marcel Pacatte
Charles Pennington
Edith Lebed
Phyllis Davis
Charles Mosley
Rich Hillstrom
Pat Conrath
Jerome Kirn
Judy Bultman

TRITON COLLEGE, 1000 Wolf Road, Northlake, Illinois 60164

Herbert Zeitlin, President
Fred Knol
E. Westphal
L. Hubbell
Arthur L. Shearburn
John B. Trebbe
Vern Magnesen
V. Stift
M. Freimanis
A. Baron
G. Mathis
A. Comstock
C. Castner
C. Woods
E. Szelestey
J. Sheehan
W. Semelroth
M. Schlicting
P. Salmon
R. Warren
J. Huiner
J. Shuben
M. Lemoine
P. Kastner
C. Ives
N. Holbrook
B. Goodwin
P. Ferguson
C. Dean
D. Cichon
G. Carter
L. Brillhart
J. Bondi
R. Becker
W. Boudro
N. Hood
R. Domabil
Mamie Christoff
Harry Behrmann
Robert D. Fisher
Gary Hinrichs
J. Larry Lane
A. Turner
L. Veenendahl
H. Deihl
R. McNamee
R. Roemer
E. Maloney
E. DeLucia
D. Libner
L. Maze
Randy Murray
R. Kozlowski
C. Erickson
David B. Raulston
Verner H. Wolf
Gordon K. Simonsen
Doris Mills
G. Cox
K. Jakus
E. Schlabach
T. Wilson
S. Bronz
R. Bruce
R. English
N. Wiegel
B. Verwiel
L. Smith
M. Schlueter
E. Morrow
M. Reasor
J. Silva
A. Schultz
S. McDonald
M. Leerstang
S. Jameson
D. Hunt
M. Haubold
E. Fielitz
J. Dreas
W. Collien
A. Castino
W. Bruyn
D. Bourbulas
M. Berd
C. Bauer
V. Schreiner
M. Kapraun
T. Armagno
Harriett Baird
Frank DeGrado
Neal Voke
John Hanson
Alex Lane
P. Fricano
R. Ouiyach
J. Kroc
E. Krol
S. Larson
F. McCann
V. Leu
R. Kubacki
Peter Stronge
Joseph Vozella, Jr.

WABASH VALLEY COLLEGE, 2222 College, Mt. Carmel, Illinois 62863

R. W. Bowen, President
Della Marie Yates
Danny Vest
Vera C. Laughlin
Tony Bowles

WAUBONSEE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, 15 South Lake Street, Post Office Box 431,
Aurora, Illinois 60507

James H. Nelson, President
J. W. Hoban
Lucile Gustafson
Thomas Redd
Jon Duerr
Mary Jane Coffel
Stanley Roe
Roberta Hann
Robert Acosta
Dorothy Becker
David R. Pierce
Evar Erickson
James Pilcher
Lee Thompson
Larry Scranton
Stanley R. Groh
Steve Rahn

CENTRAL YMCA COLLEGE, Chicago, Illinois

Donald A. Canar
Robert E. Haverkamp
C. K. Patel
Thomas K. Safford
Stephen T. Andrews
Thomas Mirabile
Lawrence Faulkner
Harrison C. Heyl
Kenneth J. Mattran
John W. Bouseman
Lucinda Ewing
Leon Dingle, Jr.
Francis Giles

WINSTON CHURCHILL COLLEGE, Pontiac, Illinois

A. A. Paloumpis

KENDALL COLLEGE, Evanston, Illinois

Wesley Westerberg
Caryl Turner
Elizabeth Canar
Tom Wylie
Everett B. Sproul
Sarah Campbell
Fred Suwe

LINCOLN COLLEGE, Lincoln, Illinois

David Castillon
Tom Smith
Ken Krueger
John Poertner
Scott Morrison
Rod S. Seaton

MACCORMAC COLLEGE, Chicago, Illinois

Willard S. Kautter
Mary Borchardt
C. Chouinard
Gordon Borchardt

MALLINCKRODT COLLEGE, Wilmette, Illinois

Sister M. Coronata, SCC
Sister M. Virginia, SCC
Sister M. Thomas, SCC

ROBERT MORRIS COLLEGE, Carthage, Illinois

Lawrence W. Sherman, Jr.
Richard Reed
David Havlik
Eileen Davis
Dean Nichols
Lee Covitt
Bill Barker
Pamela Nestor
Jack C. Watson
David Fulton
Al Fisch
Maxine Crossland
Larry Lagow
Mark Hachigian

AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING, Champaign

Thomas C. Oliver

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES, Washington, D.C.

Frank Mensel

BLUE CROSS-BLUE SHIELD

R. B. Worthington
(Rockford)
Charles C. Freeman
(Bloomington)

BOARD OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION, 405 Centennial Building, Springfield, Illinois

George A. Richter
Claudia M. Durham
H. M. Strubinger
Ed Fitzgibbon
Louise M. Dailey
Kenneth G. Evans
Elsie Hagancamp
Gerald Gladden

BUSINESS & INDUSTRY COUNCIL

W. G. Kimmel
(Rock Island)

CHICAGO TRIBUNE

Peter Negronida

CONTINENTAL ILLINOIS NATIONAL BANK

Frank Cavico
John Horrigan
John Keane

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OFFICE

George T. Gilluly
Arthur J. Stejskal

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Donald L. Beatty

I.B.M., Chicago

Larry Saslaw
Paul Biernat

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Harry C. Bostick

HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 214

Roderick C. McLennan
(Mt. Prospect)

STATE FARM INSURANCE, Bloomington

William Grogg
Dave Polzin

Stroup, Clyde H. - Dentist
Shorewood, Wisconsin

SUNSTRAND CORPORATION, Rockford

Joe Rayhill
James Nelson

UNIVERSITY CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

Kathryn G. Hansen
Ralph W. Ivens
Albert R. Imle

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY, Peoria, Illinois

Orville Nothdurft

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, Charleston, Illinois

Maurice W. Manbeck
W. S. Lowell
Martin Schaefer
Wayne D. Coleman

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY, Normal, Illinois

E. A. Lichty
Arnold Conson
Joseph Durham
A. Helgeson
Charles Porter
Richard R. Bond

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, Chicago, Illinois

Harry A. Blanton

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, DeKalb, Illinois

Ralph Belnap
W. K. Ogilvie
Arthur C. Muns
Art Burrichter
Henry Yankow

NORTHEASTERN ILLINOIS STATE, Chicago, Illinois

Herbert F. Lamp

NORTHWESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, Evanston, Illinois

Charles Siebert
Margaret Lee
Jacquelyn Reyz
Harold Martin
Christine Fox

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, Carbondale, Illinois

Robert MacVicar
Robert A. McGrath
Jack R. Bopp
Harold Engelking
W. J. McKeefery
Donald J. Tolle

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, Edwardsville, Illinois

Henry T. Boss
S. D. Lovell
James Brown
George H. Goodwin
N. V. Schmitt

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Urbana, Illinois

Ernest F. Anderson
John W. Alden
Robert P. Link
Cecil D. Smith
Shari Wilcox
John T. Warren
H. L. Wakeland
Thomas C. Bloomer
William Wallner

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS - CIRCLE CAMPUS, Chicago, Illinois

Kenneth Bidl
Julius Menacker

WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, Macomb, Illinois

Carlson E. Crane
Howard Nudd
James Brinkman
Gary Reddig
Jay W. Stein
James Murphy
C. Orville Elliott
Ronald Beveridge
William Watts
Marcy G. Bodine
Robert E. Elkin
Edwin Becht
Virginia L. Bean
Ann L. Lamb
Leo W. Manning
John Juskevice
Forrest Suycott
Frank D. Sorenson
Don Viar
Frederick P. Abel
Robert Findley
Harry Fritz
G. R. Schwartz
Joe Domitrz
Douglas W. Wylie
Harry S. Gillespie
Loren K. Robinson
Wendell L. Swanson
Mary Jane Eshelman
Arnold Wendt
Margaret Allen

DEPAUL UNIVERSITY, Chicago, Illinois

Irma T. Halfter

CHILDS & SMITH, INC.

Avery Jacobek

ANTHONY L. DELEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

Anthony L. Deley

DURRANT, DEININGER, DOMMER, KRAMER & GORDON

Donovan D. Kramer
(Dubuque, Iowa)

FRIDSTEIN, FITCH AND PARTNERS

Marvin Fitch

Erie Jones

C. EDWARD WARE ARCHITECTS

C. Edward Ware

Otto Kerner, United States Circuit Judge, United States Court of Appeals, Chicago, Illinois

Lyman A. Glenny, Executive Director, Illinois Board of Higher Education

Robert C. Bartlett, North Central Association, and Mrs. Bartlett

William S. Griffith, University of Chicago

END
10-27-69